



**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
 ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2016 @ 6:30 P.M.**

GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM JANUARY 19, 2016 <i>(Click here to view the draft minutes.)</i>	VOTE:
ELECTION OF OFFICERS	OFFICERS:

REGULAR ITEMS

ITEM 1: <i>(Click here to view packet.)</i>	Z15-001, CHERRY TREE ESTATES / PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP)	
LOCATION:	Quebec and Cherry Creek Dr	VOTE:
ACREAGE:	10.656	<input type="checkbox"/> IN FAVOR
EXISTING ZONING:	A-2	<input type="checkbox"/> OPPOSED
PROPOSED USE:	MU-PUD	<input type="checkbox"/> ABSENT
APPLICANT:	Melissa Kendrick, MK Consulting, Inc., on behalf of Tim Vanmeter, Property Owner	<input type="checkbox"/> ABSTAIN
CASE MANAGERS:	Planner, Molly Orkild-Larson; Engineer, Sarah L. White	
REQUEST:	Approval of PDP application.	<input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUED TO:
MOTION SUMMARY:		Date:
ITEM 2: <i>(Click here to view packet.)</i>	Z15-004, XENIA TOWNHOMES / PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP)	
LOCATION:	8850 E Mississippi Ave	VOTE:
ACREAGE:	1.48	<input type="checkbox"/> IN FAVOR
EXISTING ZONING:	R-A	<input type="checkbox"/> OPPOSED
PROPOSED USE:	R-PH	<input type="checkbox"/> ABSENT
APPLICANT:	Scott Alpert, Alpert Development	<input type="checkbox"/> ABSTAIN
CASE MANAGERS:	Planner, Bill Skinner; Engineer, Spencer Smith	
REQUEST:	Approval of PDP application.	<input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUED TO:
MOTION SUMMARY:		Date:

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for March 8, 2016.
- Planning Commission agendas, Board of County Commissioner agendas, and other important Arapahoe County information may be viewed online at www.arapahoegov.com or you may contact the Planning Division at 720-874-6650.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mark Brummel -	Richard Rader -	Paul Rosenberg, Chair Pro-Tem -
Diane Chaffin -	Jane Rieck -	Richard Sall -
Brian Weiss, Chair -		

Arapahoe County is committed to making its public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Please contact the Planning Division at 720-874-6650 or 720-874-6574 TDD, at least three (3) days prior to a meeting, should you require special accommodations.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2016**

ATTENDANCE	<p>A regular meeting of the Arapahoe County Planning Commission was called and held in accordance with the statutes of the State of Colorado and the Arapahoe County Land Development Code. The following Planning Commission members confirmed their continued qualification to serve:</p> <p>Brian Weiss, Chair; Mark Brummel; Richard Rader; Jane Rieck; Richard Sall, and Diane Chaffin.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sue Liu, Engineer; Sherman Feher, Senior Planner; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager; David Schmit, PWD Director, and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Chair Weiss called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.</p>
DISCLOSURE MATTERS	<p>There were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them.</p>
REGULAR ITEMS:	
Item 1:	<p>Z15-003, Denver Jewish Senior Living / Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) – Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson distributed information provided by the applicant and introduced the application for a PUD for assisted living and memory care for residents 55 years of age and older. She reported the property was located along Wabash, adjacent to the Denver Jewish Day School. She stated the height of the facility, which had originally been proposed for 55 feet, had been reduced to 47 feet, in response to neighborhood concerns. Ms. Orkild-Larson reported no residents would drive. She said the parking would include shared spaces with the adjacent school, verified by a letter from the school. She reported documentation had been provided via a parking study to demonstrate sufficiency of parking for the facility, as proposed; however, the proposal differed from the parking standards established within the Arapahoe County Land Development Code</p>

(LDC). Ms. Orkild-Larson stated referral comments were received from neighboring property owners with concerns about density, parking, and building height. Further, she stated the Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association generally supported the use for the property, but noted concerns with building height. Ms. Orkild-Larson addressed several questions from Planning Commissioners and noted the applicant would be providing additional details when they presented.

John Griffis, Buccaneer Development, Inc., applicant / developer, introduced the project and project team, including Susan Stanton, Entitlement Advisor. He presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He reviewed the site location and vicinity map. Mr. Griffis said the project provided a needed housing type in relation to the school, Wabash Street and Bridge, realignment of Wabash St Relationship to Cherry Creek, and regional detention facility across Wabash. He reported on neighborhood outreach with the immediate neighbors and residents of Cherry Creek Country Club. He stated the development team attended two meetings of the Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association on September 30th (development review team) and October 14th (general meeting). Mr. Griffis summarized the comments and concerns that were heard as a result. He explained the reasoning for the 47-foot building height, for the three-story facility, had to do with the planned use of the building and the requirements for meeting needs not seen in single-family and multi-family housing. He presented the results of a view corridor study from four different views and explained the distances from the various homes (single-family homes and townhouses) and the golf course and showed visual perspectives of the views of the proposed building. Mr. Griffis summarized why Denver Jewish Senior Living was a good project, noting the following positive impacts: 1) the property dynamics, 2) various County plans, 3) use for senior living vs. apartments, 4) senior living use is essentially a “down zoning,” 5) negligible impacts to existing view corridors, 6) building height of 47 feet was lower than the CCCC Clubhouse height of 49 ft 6 in, 7) minimal traffic impact as no residents would drive, 8) provided a needed housing type in the community, and 9) provided employment opportunities.

The PC asked for clarification on whether any residents would be allowed to have a car and noted personal experiences with senior

living residents who continued to drive and have their own cars available.

Mr. Gary Prager, H+L Architecture, architect, noted he had been doing these projects for 30 years and had yet to see an assisted living facility (as opposed to independent living) that would allow a resident to drive.

PC members asked questions about staff, visiting medical staff, and visitors coming to the site and how these people would be accommodated with parking.

There was discussion about parking calculations used by the Cities of Aurora and Lakewood and the City and County of Denver and how those compared to County regulations.

Mr. Weiss noted the requested parking ratio was lower than the applicant's parking study recommended.

Ms. Orkild-Larson noted some of the numbers were reported as peak parking usage for weekdays and weekends, during times of high visitation.

Mr. Brummel requested clarification on the agreement with the school to use part of its parking.

Mr. Griffis indicated there might be room for additional negotiation with the school for more spaces.

Ms. Chaffin asked for clarification on the 35% open space and whether that could be used to provide more parking.

Mr. Griffis noted the open space areas including a secured, outdoor garden for residents.

There were additional discussions regarding facilities for drop-offs and pick-ups of residents, location of parking, and access to the property.

Ms. Orkild-Larson noted the 35% open space was a code requirement for the SH-PUD district.

Mr. Griffis answered questions about the interior of the building that led to the building height request. He noted there was currently no provider selected. As a result, the requirements could vary

depending on which provider was selected and what kinds of systems and interior design were desired for resident comfort, special ventilation needs, additional ceiling height to compensate for the narrow profile of the building dictated by the property configuration, and a visual shielding of roof-mounted mechanical equipment. He explained deeper trusses allowed larger expanses without load-bearing walls, which provided greater flexibility to the provider on sizing units, placement of shared facilities, such as dining halls, etc. He stated once a provider was selected, the design of the project could be more specific.

Mr. Radar referenced an old landfill that was within 1,000 feet of the project and asked for the location.

Ms. Orkild-Larson noted there was an exhibit from Tri-County Health Department in the board packets.

Mr. Weiss opened the hearing for public comments.

Kevin Gross, S. Boston St., said he had met with the applicants as part of the Four Square Mile planning committee. He disagreed with the applicant's statement that the committee originally agreed to the 47-ft building height and later changed their minds. He felt the perspectives shown were misleading and that there might be other view corridors within which the building would be more visible. He indicated the Four Square Mile group did not initially comment on parking, given the opportunity for shared use with the school, but questioned the proximity to the facility and any future use of this building if it was no longer needed for senior living in the future. Mr. Gross noted Paul Hanley and Mark Lampert were unable to attend, but asked to be allowed to read their comments into the record. The letter he read noted most buildings in the Four Square Mile area were subject to a height restriction of 35 feet and the taller CCCC Clubhouse was isolated within the golf course and screened by a wall. Comments also voiced the opinion, as the current zoning on the property would have a height of 35 feet, that limit should apply to the new zoning and 47 feet was unacceptable for a three-story building. Comments also noted a negotiated 38-ft building height for Denver Senior Living at the time the PDP was approved by the Board for a proposed facility on Iliff.

Mr. Rich Laws, 8931 E Wesley Ave., stated he also disagreed with the perspectives in the view corridor study. He noted those were

from the elevation of the golf course and the homes were all walk-out basement homes with two stories. He stated the view from the second story of these homes would be different. Mr. Laws also noted all homes along the eastern edge of the CCCC development were restricted to 35 ft. in height to protect view corridors of other homes and had been honored by the County. He shared having had several presubmittal meetings with staff on various projects. He was told a change in density would require a Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) amendment. Mr. Rich felt the project was not consistent with the density of the Four Square Mile SubArea Plan, but said the Wabash location might warrant a change in the density allowed by the Comp Plan. He shared his personal experience with another senior living facility that had significant street-parking impacts during times of high visitation. He stated the plans were too vague at this point; as more specific plans came forward, residents of CCCC would realize the proposed height was a bigger impact than they realized.

Mr. Halzel, 5603 S. Helena St., representing Denver Jewish Day School, confirmed parking was available and the parking spaces nearest the senior living site were least used by the school when it is in session. He stated the school supported the project and believed it would be a great addition to the neighborhood, as well as, a great relationship for the students of the school.

There were no further public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weiss offered the applicant an opportunity to respond to comments.

Mr. Griffis noted the differences between senior living and multi-family apartment homes. He believed there would be more flexibility in building height as plans were finalized with the Final Development Plan (FDP); however, the project team felt this was an appropriate maximum height for the PDP. He also noted marketing efforts by the school, over the past several years, and commented their development team was the only one to make an offer. Mr. Griffis noted this site was on a fringe area and wasn't close to higher-density areas of the community, with homes in closer proximity, so impacts from height were different.

	<p>The PC generally supported the use, but expressed concerns over the parking and building height. The PC asked staff why the building height would not be set at the FDP stage of the process when plans for the project were better known and closer to final, rather than approving height at the PDP stage when plans were still vague.</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson noted that heights and setbacks were considered zoning parameters.</p> <p>Mr. Griffis indicated, if parking and building heights were issues that would prevent the case from moving forward, the applicants would appreciate a continuance for additional time to work on this. He felt discrepancies could be worked out within the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Brummel to continue Case No. Z15-003, Denver Jewish Senior Living / Preliminary Development Plan, to a date certain of February 2, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. to allow the applicant additional time to work on height and parking concerns.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes, Mr. Sall, Yes.</p>
<p>Item 2:</p>	<p>Z15-005, KOA Kampground Stasburg / Conventional Rezone – Sherman Feher, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Mr. Feher, Senior Planner, introduced the case and provided a summary of the application request.</p> <p>Mr. Jacobson, applicant, explained the proposal to expand the existing KOA campground, its high usage during summer months, and the desire to provide a safe, clean, family atmosphere for camping and related social activities for campers and visitors to the area. He noted the expansion would allow them to serve more customers and would bring additional visitors and economic benefits to the area.</p> <p>Mr. Brummel had some questions of clarification as to the expansion with respect to the creek bed.</p> <p>Ms. Rieck asked how long people generally stayed at the</p>

campground.

Mr. Jacobson responded about one-third stayed one night, approximately one-third stayed four or five days and made day trips to other locations, and slightly less than one-third stayed monthly, while working in the area.

There were continued discussions related to proximity to the creek bed, changes needed due to location of part of the facility within the flood zone (higher bases for electrical connections), how long the current owners had run the campground (since 2012), and whether there had been any flood problems within the campground (there was water in the creek, but not in the campground since the owners purchased the property).

Mr. Weiss opened the hearing for public comments.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Feher stated staff was recommending approval with the listed conditions in the staff report. He noted the project could actually expand to the other side of the creek, though that was not currently being proposed; further, that expansion would need to be worked out with engineering. He reported, should the applicant determine to expand to the other side of the creek, no additional hearings would be required because use was allowed within the O and F zone districts.

Mr. Brummel noted camping on the east side of the creek would require additional exits in case the creek floods while people were camping; he felt that would be a major undertaking.

Ms. Liu indicated a new drainage study was just completed and no bridge was planned. She explained that even though there was not another land development approval required additional engineering permit processes, if additional camping facilities were planned.

Mr. Haskins addressed additional questions on floodplain requirements for camping facilities and RV storage.

Mr. Feher stated storage must be accessory to camping; RV storage was not an allowed use.

	<p>It was moved by Mr. Weiss and duly seconded by Ms. Rieck to recommend approval of Case Z15-005, KOA Kampground Strasburg / Conventional Rezone, with staff findings and conditions as outlined in the staff report dated January 7, 2016.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes, Mr. Sall, Yes.</p>
<p>STUDY SESSION ITEMS:</p>	
<p>Item 1:</p>	<p>Land Development Code (LDC) Assessment – Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager</p> <p>Mary Roberts, Clarion Associates, presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record.</p> <p>The PC expressed concerns about a potentially reduced role in land development cases and the loss of a public forum for people to discuss development in their neighborhoods.</p> <p>Ms. Roberts noted the PC would continue to conduct hearings on initial zoning and PUD’s, so there would still be a public forum.</p> <p>Time was spent discussing thresholds for site plan and final development plan public hearings and examples from other communities. It was noted other communities required public hearings for site plans that were: 1) over a certain acreage or square footage, 2) considering 24-hour uses, 3) adjacent to residential areas, 4) expected to exceed a certain number of dwelling units, etc.</p> <p>Ms. Roberts said that part of developing the LDC would be determining which public hearing thresholds were appropriate for Arapahoe County.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners expressed a desire to have a better organized, more image-heavy, and user friendly LDC.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>

ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
February 16, 2016
6:30 P.M.

SUBJECT: Z15-001 – CHERRY TREE ESTATES, PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

MOLLY ORKILD-LARSON, SENIOR PLANNER


FEBRUARY 8, 2016

LOCATION:

The Cherry Tree Estate development is proposed northeast of and across Cherry Creek from the South Quebec Street and Cherry Creek Drive South intersection. It is also situated in Commissioner District No. 4.



Vicinity Map



Zoning Map

ADJACENT SUBDIVISIONS, ZONING, AND LAND USES:

- North - Immediately north is the Chennai Park and Concha Townhouses located in the City and County of Denver. The zoning is Open Space-Public Parks (OS-A) and Planned Unit Development (PUD), respectively.
- South - Cherry Creek corridor located within the City and County of Denver and zoned Open Space-Conservation (OS-C).
- East - Granville West townhome development and is located within the City and County of Denver. The zoning is Residential (R-2-A).

West - Cherry Creek corridor located within the City and County of Denver and is zoned OS-C.

PROPOSAL:

The applicant, Kendrick Consulting, Inc., on behalf of the property owner, Cherry Tree Estates, LLC, is seeking approval of a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) known as Case No. Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates PDP.

The property is infill development surrounded by the City and County of Denver. The PDP proposes to rezone the 10.656 acre parcel from an Agricultural District (A-2) to Mixed Use - Planned Unit Development (MU-PUD).

As indicated on the PDP, the applicant proposes a residential community for individuals 55 years of age or older needing assistance in one or more daily life activities due to handicaps that limit their capacities to care for themselves (assisted living) and residential housing for independent seniors.

The applicant proposes that this community comply with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act (HOPA), which exempts senior housing communities from certain anti-discrimination provisions of the Fair Housing Act. In order to qualify for the exemption for housing for older persons, at least 80 percent of the occupied units must be occupied by at least one person who is 55 years of age or older and the community must publish and follow policies and procedures which demonstrate an intent to be a 55 and older community. The County, however, is not the responsible enforcement authority for the Fair Housing Act or the requirements of HOPA.

Planning Areas

This subject parcel is divided into two development areas, Planning Areas 1 and 2. These areas are separated by a 75' wide overhead electrical easement.

Planning Area 1:

Planning Area 1 is 4.8 acres in size and proposes a maximum of 10 dwelling units (du) with a density of 2.06 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Land uses proposed for this area include assisted living and single family attached dwelling units for seniors living independently.

The assisted living will be housed in a residence and contain a kitchen, one to two living areas, and bedrooms to accommodate up to 16 residents, as specified on the PDP. The applicant defines an assisted living residence as *“A residential facility that makes available to three (3) or more persons, not related to the owner of such facility, either directly or indirectly through a resident agreement with the resident, room and board and at least the following services: personal services; protective oversight; social care*

Access

Access to the development will be from S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue through the City and County of Denver (City) property. The applicant has obtained access permits for both points of access from the City. The primary access to the site will be from S. Quebec Street and restricted to a right-in and right-out turning movement. The approval of these permits were based on a conceptual design developed by SEH which takes into consideration sight distance triangles, fire truck turning radii and existing utility poles and bridge along S. Quebec Street, see attached letter.

The roadway within the development will be private and designed with traffic calming measures which may include one or more elements such as a curvilinear roadway design, roundabouts, signage, speed bumps and gates at either or both entrances and exits of the development. The road layout will be determined with the Final Development Plan (FDP), but was requested by neighbors to be addressed due to concerns about serving as a potential cut-through from S. Quebec Street to E. Colorado Avenue.

Architecture

The applicant is proposing the development's architectural styles to be similar in character to the single family and attached housing in the adjacent neighborhoods. The architecture of the development is to be constructed with materials that may include but not limited to wood, brick, stone and metal with typical asphalt or similar roofing materials. Wall expanses will have openings or changes in elevation or plane. Specific materials and architectural treatments will be determined at FDP.

Floodplain

County requirement for a new "at-risk population facilities" such as elder care is to have continuous non-inundated access during a 100-year flood event. Current FEMA floodplain mapping has a small section of the site and potential access roads within the 100 year floodplain. There is an existing Flood Hazard Area Delineation (FHAD) from October 2013 that removes all portions of the site and both access roads from the floodplain. The FHAD is currently under review with FEMA (minimum 18 months for review time). The FHAD will need to be approved/accepted by FEMA prior to the FDP approval or access roads may need to be elevated or relocated out of floodplain. Access points are general concepts at this time based on access permits from City and County of Denver.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the application be approved based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval outlined herein.

I. BACKGROUND

The existing zoning for this parcel is A-2 and vacant. The property is unplatted and was created as a remnant parcel. The parcel is triangular in shape and surrounded by the City and County of Denver.

The south portion of the project, Planning Area 2, is the location of a former Denver municipal waste site. With the closure of the waste site, the parcel continued to be the local dumping ground (i.e., grass clippings, tree branches, etc.). There are 24 monitoring wells on the property operated by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) to monitor methane. Six monitoring wells are still producing methane gas. The applicant has been speaking with CDPHE about their voluntary cleanup program and developing a Materials Management Plan. The applicant plans to remove all land fill material prior to developing the site. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that the applicant remove land fill debris on-site before development occurs.

II. DISCUSSION

Staff review of this application included a comparison of the proposal to: 1) applicable policies and goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan; 2) review of pertinent zoning regulations; and 3) analysis of referral comments.

1. The Comprehensive Plan

Comprehensive Plan: This application complies with the following Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan, as follows:

- Goal GM 4 – Promote Compact Growth in the Urban Service Area.
The proposed development maximizes existing public facilities.
- Policy GM 4.3 – Promote Infill Development and Redevelopment in the Urban Service Area.
The proposal provides infill development.
- Goal PFS1 – Plan for Adequate Public Facilities and Services in Growth Areas.
Based on responses from service providers, adequate public facilities and services are present in the area.
- Policy NH 1.2 – Promote a Diversity of Housing types in Growth Areas Countywide.
If approved, the proposal would promote a housing type that is in demand.
- Policy NH 3.2 – Support Provision of Special-Needs Housing in Growth Areas.
The proposal supports the provision of elderly housing.

Four Square Mile (4SQM) Subarea Plan:

The Comprehensive Plan's 4SQM Subarea Plan designates this site as Urban Residential (1-12 du/ac) and Potential Park/Open Space.

Urban Residential primary uses include: detached single family dwellings, single family attached (duplex, triplex, four-plex, townhouse, row houses), and small multi-family dwelling units. Secondary uses include: neighborhood commercial centers, parks and recreation facilities, places of worship, and schools, both public and private. The development density is one to 12 dwelling units per gross acre. The applicant's proposal meets the density provided by the 4SQM Subarea Plan for Urban Residential.

2. Land Development Code (LDC) Review

Section 9-100 MU-Mixed Use:

The applicant proposes to rezone the parcel to Mixed Use Planned Unit Development (MU-PUD) in order to provide assisted living services to individuals under the age of 55 years. The Senior Housing zone district doesn't allow this. The applicant also preferred to use the Federal requirement of at least 80 percent of the occupied units must be occupied by at least one person who is 55 years of age rather than the County's Senior Housing requirement of "at least one resident per unit."

Section 13-100 Planned Unit Development:

This Section of the LDC states that the PUD process is intended to prevent the creation of a monotonous urban landscape by allowing for the mixture of uses which might otherwise be considered non-compatible, through the establishment of flexible development standards, provided said standards:

- A. Recognize the limitations of existing and planned infrastructure, by thorough examination of the availability and capability of water, sewer, drainage, and transportation systems to serve present and future land uses.

The property is within Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District. Stormwater drainage and detention for the site will be accommodated on the parcel.

The applicant has obtained access permits from the City and County of Denver for both access points to the site. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was also conducted and demonstrated that the proposed development will generate a low level of traffic.

RTD bus service is available on S. Quebec Street which is directly west of the site.

- B. Assure compatibility between the proposed development, surrounding land uses, and the natural environment.

While the 4SQM Subarea Plan does not mention a specific height limit for residential, it does have a strategy to address transition between buildings of varied scale:

“Strategy: (To) Consider residential zoning districts for the Four Square Mile Area crafted to address such issues as density of development, building mass (size and bulk), scale and building height to encourage compatibility with adjacent developed properties.” (Four Square Mile Subarea Plan, Page 2 – Vision Statement)

The applicant believes the proposed development is compatible with the surrounding residential development by:

- *Restricting the buildings in Planning Area 1 to two stories which matches the number of stories of the adjacent Concha subdivision;*
- *Restricting the buildings in Planning Area 2 to three stories which matches the number of stories of the adjacent Granville West townhomes; and,*
- *Using similar architectural styles and materials of the surrounding neighborhoods.*

To further enhance compatibility with the adjacent single-family homes, staff recommends requiring pitched roofs on all buildings in Planning Area 1 oriented parallel to the property line to provide a transition from lower heights adjacent to neighboring properties to the maximum building height at the peak of the roof.

- C. Allow for the efficient and adequate provision of public services. Applicable public services include, but are not limited to, police, fire, school, parks, and libraries.

The proposal can be served by existing public services.

- D. Enhance convenience for the present and future residents of Arapahoe County by ensuring that appropriate supporting activities, such as employment, housing, leisure time, and retail centers are in close proximity to one another.

The proposed development will provide employment opportunities and housing types (independent senior and assisted living housing) that are in demand.

- E. Ensure that public health and safety is adequately protected against natural and man-made hazards, which include, but are not limited to, traffic noise, water pollution, airport hazards, and flooding.

Tri-County Health Department indicates in their referral letter that the subject property is located on a former landfill and flammable gas from the landfill can be a hazard. This agency recommends that the applicant to work with CDPHE Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division to develop a Materials Management Plan and other related plans and incorporate flammable gas control systems into the project.

Tri-County Health contacted CDPHE on January 25, 2016 to discuss the proposed cleanup of the property by the applicant. If the applicant removes all landfill material on the property Tri-County Health then doesn't see the need to install flammable gas control systems on-site.

The applicant is aware of the site's history and has met with CDPHE to discuss what process and management plan will be needed for the removal of the on-site debris. Staff suggests making a condition of approval to address this issue at Final Development Plan (FDP).

- F. Provide for accessibility within the proposed development and between the development and existing adjacent uses. Adequate on-site interior traffic circulation, public transit, pedestrian avenues, parking, and thoroughfare connections are all factors to be examined when determining the accessibility of a site.

At this time nothing more than proposed points of access are available for review. Per Section 13-107.M of the LDC, a PDP may indicate conceptual points of access; while access points are not considered approved by Arapahoe County until the FDP, staff would note the access locations in this case are under the control of the City and County of Denver. The applicant has received permits from the City and County of Denver for access onto S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue.

Denver Planning has received a referral on the PDP. Denver Public Works will be notified of the land use change if the PDP is approved and will receive a referral for the future FDP application.

A detailed analysis of any internal roadways will be conducted when a site plan is submitted at the time of the FDP. Staff also recommends that pedestrian access be provided for the public between existing sidewalks on S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue for improved access to Chennai Park and to transit routes on S. Quebec Street, with the location to be determined with the future FDP application. Staff recommends as a condition of approval the applicant provide a path connecting S. Quebec Street with E. Colorado Avenue.

The applicant proposes to meet the parking standards as per the LDC. The applicant has noted on the PDP that modification to the parking ratio for the assisted living residences may be requested during the FDP.

- G. Minimize disruption to existing physiographic features, including vegetation, streams, lakes, soil types and other relevant topographical elements.

No significant physiographic features exist on this site. Cherry Creek is located immediately south of the site and the applicant has no plans to disrupt the stream channel.

Open Space provided an initial referral letter encouraging the applicant to create an 8' sidewalk along the southern edge of the property to connect S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue and also along the entrances of the development. The applicant had concerns regarding the safety of its residents if there was a pathway through the development and Open Space retracted their request. However, through further review, staff believes implementation of a path can be designed to be safe and will benefit the seniors living in this community by giving them access to the Cherry Creek trail and adjacent neighborhoods. Staff recommends as a condition of approval for the applicant to develop a path connecting S. Quebec Street to E. Colorado Avenue.

- H. Ensure that the amenities provided adequately enhance the quality of life in the area, by creating a comfortable and aesthetically enjoyable environment through conventions, such as, the preservation of mountain views, the creation of landscaped open areas, and the establishment of recreational activities.

The proposed PDP sets requirements in the form of a minimum open space requirement. Additional detail in the form of landscape plans, vegetation specifications, and architectural elevations will be required with the FDP.

The subject site is located adjacent to the Cherry Creek Trail corridor. The Cherry Creek Trail is part of the Denver Urban Area network of trails and connects directly to many of the area's significant bike/pedestrian trail corridors as well as regional park facilities.

Impacts to mountain views will be similar to those created by any of the wide variety of structures existing in the area.

- I. Enhance the usable open spaces in Arapahoe County and provide sufficient unobstructed open spaces and recreational areas to accommodate a project's residents and employees.

The PDP allocates 35% of the property to unobstructed open space (not within public rights-of-way and detention areas).

3. Referral Comments

Comments received during the referral process are as follows:

Referral Agency	Comments
Arapahoe County Long Range Planning	Recommended the removal of multi-family as a principal land use for the development. The applicant has complied.
Arapahoe County Engineering Services Division	Staff is working with the applicant to address all engineering comments.
Arapahoe County Mapping	Staff is working with the applicant to address all mapping comments.
Arapahoe County Open Space	Two letters were received; first recommending the placement of an 8' path through the development connecting E. Colorado Avenue to S. Quebec Street; the second withdrawing this request due to safety concerns of the residents. Staff has re-evaluated this request and believes that a path can be designed to addresses safety issues and therefore is recommending as a condition of approval that a path be developed in the FDP connecting these streets and providing access to the Cherry Creek Trail.
Arapahoe County Zoning	No comments.
Arapahoe County Assessor	No response received.
Arapahoe County Sheriff	No comments.
Arapahoe County Library District	No comments.
City and County of Denver – Planning	No response received.
City and County of Denver – Wastewater Management	No comments.
Cunningham Fire Protection District	No issues with the PDP.
Arapahoe County Parks and Recreation District	No response received.
Post Office Growth Coordinator	No response received.
Cherry Creek School District	District understands the facility will not have any children; therefore, no cash-in-lieu fees will be required. However, if in the future, the utilization changes to include children, District reserves the right to ask for fees.
Tri-County Health Department	Indicates the subject property is located on a former landfill and flammable gas from this material is a hazard. This agency recommends that the applicant to work with CDPHE to develop a Materials Management Plan and incorporate flammable gas control systems into

	the project.
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE)	County staff contacted Fonda Apostolopoulous at CDPHE. The applicant has contacted Mr. Apostolopoulous about removing the organic debris from the site and a Materials Management Plan addressing removal of the debris is anticipated to be submitted. Removal of the debris will remove the methane on-site and enable the site to be developed.
Four Square Mile Neighborhoods	4SQM is in support of the application. Recommends that the height of the buildings in Planning Area 2 be reduced from 42' to 38'.
West Arapahoe Conservation District	No response received.
E-470 Authority	No response received.
RTD	No response received.
Century Link	No response received.
Xcel Energy	Xcel indicates no conflicts at this time. When plans are finalized, the applicant will need to submit those plans for Xcel's review and approval.
Army Corps. of Engineers	No response received.
Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority (SEMSWA)	Comments have been addressed.
East Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation (ECCV)	Property is within its service area. Water and sewer service is available subject to extension of lines, payment of all fees and District's rules.
Urban Drainage	No response received.
Concha Townhome Association	Many concerns see discussion; see attached emails and discussion below.
Park at Indian Creek	No response received.
Cook Park Neighborhood Association	No response received.

4. Meetings

Concha Townhouse Association (HOA): The property owner and his representatives met with the HOA on September 30, 2014, August 11, 2015 and November 3, 2015.

Several emails dated April 22, 2015 and August 24, 2015 from the HOA were received by staff. These letters expressed the following:

- Maximum building heights could potentially allow for three and four story buildings;

- Density in the Letter of Intent does not match the information on the site plan;
- Concerns of the removal and addition of site information on the site plan;
- Traffic Impact Analysis isn't accurate, doesn't reflect full build-out for both Planning Areas and doesn't anticipate additional traffic generated by a non-gated road allowing through traffic and doesn't provide mitigation methods to relieve potential impacts at the Iowa and Quebec intersection;
- Request the implementation of a bulk plane along the property line of the Concha Townhouse development;
- Need to delineate on-site drainage along with sound and visual buffers between Concha Townhouse subdivision and proposed development;
- Want the internal road to be private and gated;
- Need to reword the County's Landscape Maintenance and Drainage Master Plan notes so that the Concha development isn't responsible for the proposed development's landscape maintenance and design and construction of drainage connection systems;
- Need to comply with Dark Skies guidelines;
- Need to clarify the age restrictions, off-street parking requirements; materials of buildings;
- Concern of having commercial mobile radio facilities as an allowed accessory use; and,
- Request to limit the hours of construction and a bio-waste removal plan.

Staff comments: The applicant has addressed the above concerns in letters dated November 3, 2015 and November 6, 2015 and as follows:

- **Building Height:** *Planning Area 1 has been reduced from 35' to 32' with a maximum of two-stories, and Planning Area 2 has been reduced from 45' to 42' with a maximum of three-stories. Further, staff is recommending as a condition that that all buildings feature pitched roofs in Planning Area 1 oriented parallel to the property line.*
- **Density:** *There was confusion regarding the density since the Letter of Intent and the PDP initially conflicted. The proposed density is shown on the PDP.*
- **Removal/Addition of Information on the PDP Document:** *Staff recommended the applicant follow the requirements of the PDP and show the site design in more of a conceptual manner since a final design and layout for the project has not been solidified. This reduces future modifications of the PDP. The applicant was also asked to revise text, numbers, etc. on the PDP to further clarify or correct information that wasn't accurate.*
- **Traffic Impact Analysis:** *A Traffic Impact Study is required for PDPs unless waived by the County. This study was waived by the Engineering Division since the development met the Traffic Impact Study Waiver Request criteria. However, to assist in understanding the impacts of the development, the*

applicant's engineer prepared a traffic study for the PDP that consists of a maximum of 112 assisted living care facility residents with 28 employees and a maximum of 44 townhome/condo units. The study area encompasses the existing S. Quebec Street intersections of E. Iowa Avenue and Cherry Creek South Drive, the intersection of E. Colorado Avenue and Spruce Street and proposed site access. This study also assumes that the site access is provided by way of a restricted (right in/right out) on S. Quebec Street and full movement access onto E. Colorado Avenue.

This Traffic Impact Analysis uses the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual to develop the traffic generated by the development. This manual also uses traffic count data from land uses and development sizes to estimate the number of trips that a development will generate. In the study, Planning Area 1 was designated an assisted living facility and Planning Area 2 was designated as a townhouse/condominium facility. The study's predicted volume of traffic generated includes all traffic generated by residents, visiting guests, deliveries, and other traffic that would access the development. The total average daily trip for this development is 366 (Planning Area 1 - 28 employees (no residents will drive) and Planning Area 2 – 44 townhome/condo units).

The study concludes that the additional site generated traffic occurring during peak traffic hours is expected to create no discernable impact on traffic operations for the existing and surrounding roadway system; results for Year 2017 and Year 2035 total traffic conditions concludes that all existing intersections will operate at levels of service comparable to existing or background conditions during the peak hours; and, the study identifies no special roadway improvements needed to serve the proposed development.

- *Bulk Plane: The County does not have a bulk plane requirement in the Land Development Code (LDC). To address the concern of having similar and more compatible residential development adjacent to the Concha Townhouse subdivision, staff is recommending as a condition of approval that the buildings in Planning Area 1 have a pitched roof; this will have a similar impact to bulk plane requirements.*
- *Internal Road of the Development: The applicant is proposing that the internal road within the site to be private and traffic calming measures implemented to reduce or eliminate cut through traffic. These measures will be further defined in the FDP.*
- *County Standard Notes: The applicant has shown the notes as specified in the LDC. The County doesn't hold the Concha Townhouse development and/or Concha HOA responsible for the proposed applicant's landscaping or drainage.*

- Dark Skies Regulation: The County does not have a Dark Skies regulation. Applications within the County are required to adhere to Section 12-1300 Lighting Standards of the LDC, which include many Dark Skies recommendations.
- Age Restrictions, Off-street Parking Requirements and Materials of Buildings: The applicant has clarified this information on the PDP.
- Commercial Mobile Radio Facilities (wireless telecommunication facilities): The applicant has removed this accessory use from the PDP. However, commercial mobile radio facilities (attached – not freestanding and freestanding facility - concealed) in Mixed Use zone districts are permitted by administrative review process.
- Hours of Construction, Non-Emergency Service Vehicle Hours and Bio-Waste Hazard Disposal Plan: There are no County requirements specifying the hours of construction or delivery hours. County staff feels these items can be further addressed at the time of FDP. It is not clear if an assisted living facility would need a bio-waste hazard plan. If necessary, this can be addressed at the time of the FDP with CDPHE input.

Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association (4SQM): The applicant presented the application to 4SQM on September 9, 2015 and October 14, 2015. The following was discussed at these meetings:

- Setback distance to adjacent homes;
- Concern for “scope creep” on what can be built in Planning Area 2 and whether senior housing (preferred) or just homes for anyone are proposed in this area;
- Request from neighbors to gate the road that runs through the development, as the neighbors are concerned this will be a cut-through to their neighborhoods even if the road is private;
- Request to alter the layout and design of internal road to make it more meandering and less appealing as a cut-through;
- What is being done about the former landfill on the site;
- Concern about the location of access point on S. Quebec Street being controlled by City/County of Denver and not Arapahoe County with respect to safety, sight distances, and speeds on Quebec; and,
- The PDP is too vague and want a more detailed site plan.

Staff comments:

- Setback: To address the concern of having similar and more compatible residential development adjacent to the Concha Townhouse subdivision, staff is recommending as a condition of approval that all the buildings in Planning Area 1 have a pitched roof oriented parallel to the property line.

- Scope Creep: The initial submittal's principal uses for both Planning Areas were unclear and staff requested that the applicant provide clarification of what uses they're proposing. The applicant added multi-family to Planning Area 2, but has removed multi-family from the PDP in response to staff comments.
- Gated Road: The applicant proposes several traffic calming techniques that could be used to address cut-through traffic, one being gating the development. At this time, the applicant hasn't ruled out gated access as an option. These techniques will be further addressed at FDP.
- Landfill: The applicant is working with CDPHE regarding the clean-up of the property. Staff is recommending as a condition of approval for the land fill material to be removed prior to on-site construction.
- Access onto S. Quebec Street: Access to S. Quebec Street lies within the jurisdiction of the City and County of Denver, and Denver approved an access point. A right in/right out is proposed for this point of access, which is appropriate since a median exists in S. Quebec Street. This access point appears to have adequate sight distance along S. Quebec Street, see attached SEH letter. Also, having a traffic signal at S. Quebec Street and E. Cherry Creek South Drive will provide breaks in traffic allowing travelers opportunities to exit the subject site.
- PDP is Vague: The purpose of the PDP is to establish land uses and siting restrictions (setbacks, heights, etc.) for a parcel of land. The uses and siting restrictions permitted by the PDP set the general parameters with which the development must comply. After the PDP is approved, the next step is the FDP. The FDP provides specific information on the uses to be permitted and the manner in which they may be situated on the property. As part of that later review a detailed site plan will be submitted. The PDP document format meets the requirements of the LDC.

Other Public Comment:

Other emails received have concerns of adding more housing to the area, density of the development, parking, traffic that would be generated from the development onto S. Quebec Street and into surrounding neighborhoods, construction traffic and construction debris, construction fences that block the use of the social trails along Cherry Creek, who will be the occupants of the 20% of the units not required to meet the age restriction, having a vague PDP, proposed building heights and setbacks, and provision of utilities.

Field Trip:

The applicant also hosted six to eight residents from the Concha subdivision to visit his assisted living/memory care facility in Arvada on October 18, 2014.

Balloon Demonstration:

On November 14, 2015 the applicant demonstrated the height of the proposed structures on the subject property by placing balloons on poles at various locations on-site. A letter dated December 6, 2015 from Dean Foreman, Chairman of the Architectural Control Committee - Concha HOA, states that he appreciates the applicant conducting this exercise but still has concerns regarding the height of the proposed buildings and setback of the structures from the property line. To address these concerns neighbors requested the applicant to implement an angled bulk plane.

Staff comment: The County doesn't have a bulk plane regulation but has minimum setbacks and maximum building heights as means of guiding development. To prevent a building being 32' in height at the 20' setback, staff is recommending as a condition of approval that all buildings to have pitched roofs in Planning Area 1 oriented parallel to the property line. This will provide an area of transition from a lower wall height at the setback line to the maximum building height.

STAFF FINDINGS:

Staff has visited the site and reviewed the plans, supporting documentation, referral comments and citizen input in response to this application. Based on the review of applicable policies and goals, as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan, review of the development regulations and analysis of referral comments, our findings include:

1. The proposed Preliminary Development Plan for senior housing, to include assisted living and independent senior living, generally conforms to the overall goals and intent of the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan and the Four Square Mile Subarea Plan in regards to the policies set forth in those plans and nature of the development.
2. The proposed Preliminary Development Plan is consistent with development standards enumerated in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code; the Preliminary Development Plan does note that a change in a parking standard may be clarified with a future Final Development Plan application
3. The proposed Preliminary Development Plan complies with the process and other requirements outlined in Sections 9-100 MU-Mixed Use (a PUD zone district) and 13-100 Planned Unit Development (PUD) of the Arapahoe County Land Development Code.

RECOMMENDATION:

Considering the findings and other information provided herein, staff recommends approval of Case No. Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates PDP, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature of the final mylar copy of the Preliminary Development Plan, the applicant agrees to address the Planning Division, Mapping Division, and Engineering Services Division comments and concerns, as outlined in their plans and reports.
2. At the time of the Final Development Plan, the applicant shall address the landfill material on-site and presence of flammable gas (methane) to the satisfaction of the Tri-County Health Department and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.
3. Prior to construction on the property, all land fill material shall be removed from the site.
4. All buildings in Planning Area 1 shall have a pitched roof (minimum 4:12) oriented parallel to the property line to provide a transition from lower heights adjacent to neighboring properties to the maximum building height at the peak of the roof.
5. Pedestrian access shall be developed at the time of Final Development Plan connecting E. Colorado Avenue with S. Quebec Street.
6. This approval is limited to approval of a senior community that shall operate in compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act.
7. At Final Development Plan, the applicant shall develop a mechanism to assure compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act.
8. Add a note to the Preliminary Development Plan that includes:
 - a. This development is approved only as a senior community that shall operate in compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act.
 - b. At Final Development Plan, the applicant shall develop a mechanism to assure compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act (HOPA), which shall include at a minimum the adoption of appropriate covenants, leasing agreement provisions, or other policies as required under HOPA and provision for maintaining and providing data to the County when requested to assure the County that the community is being operated as senior community in compliance with HOPA.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

Recommend Conditional Approval: In the case of Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan, the Planning Commissioners have read the staff report

and received testimony at the public and find ourselves in agreement with staff findings 1 through 3, including all plans and attachments as set forth in the staff report dated February 8, 2016, and recommend approval of this application, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature of the final mylar copy of the Preliminary Development Plan, the applicant agrees to address the Planning Division, Mapping Division, and Engineering Services Division comments and concerns, as outlined in their plans and reports.
2. At the time of the Final Development Plan, the applicant shall address the landfill material on-site and presence of flammable gas (methane) to the satisfaction of the Tri-County Health Department and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.
3. Prior to construction on the property, all land fill material shall be removed from the site.
4. All buildings in Planning Area 1 shall have a pitched roof (minimum 4:12) oriented parallel to the property line to provide a transition from lower heights adjacent to neighboring properties to the maximum building height at the peak of the roof.
5. Pedestrian access shall be developed at the time of Final Development Plan connecting E. Colorado Avenue with S. Quebec Street.
6. This approval is limited to approval of a senior community that shall operate in compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act.
7. At Final Development Plan, the applicant shall develop a mechanism to assure compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act.
8. Add a note to the Preliminary Development Plan that includes:
 - a. This development is approved only as a senior community that shall operate in compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act.
 - b. At Final Development Plan, the applicant shall develop a mechanism to assure compliance with the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 Amendment to the Fair Housing Act (HOPA), which shall include at a minimum the adoption of appropriate covenants, leasing agreement provisions, or other policies as required under HOPA and provision for maintaining and providing data to the

County when requested to assure the County that the community is being operated as senior community in compliance with HOPA.

Alternative Motions – The following motions are provided as alternatives to the recommended motion for Conditional Approval:

1. **Recommend Denial:** In the case of Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan, the Planning Commissioners have read the staff report dated February 8, 2016, and received testimony at the public hearing. Based on the information presented and considered during a public hearing, we recommend the Board of County Commissioners deny the request for the Preliminary Development Plan based on the following findings:
 - a. *State new, or amended findings in support of denial.*
 - b. ...
2. **Continue to Date Certain:** In the case of Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan, I move to continue the hearing to [*date*], date certain, at 6:30 p.m., to obtain additional information and to further consider the information presented.

Attachments:

Application & Exhibits
Engineering Staff Report
Referral Comments
Meeting Information
Public Comment
Support Material



Public Works and Development
 6924 S. Lima Street
 Centennial, Colorado 80112
 Phone: 720-874-6650 FAX 720-874-6611
 www.arapahoegov.com

Land Development Application
Formal
 Form must be complete

APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE: <i>Melissa Kendrick</i>	ADDRESS: <i>362 S. Fairfax St. Denver, CO 80246</i>	SIGNATURE: <i>Melissa Kendrick</i>
PHONE:	FAX:	NAME: <i>Melissa Kendrick</i>
EMAIL:		TITLE: <i>owner</i>
OWNER(S) OF RECORD: <i>Tim Van Meter</i>	ADDRESS: <i>P.O. Box 1352 Arvada, CO 80001</i>	SIGNATURE: <i>Tim Van Meter</i>
PHONE: <i>303-888-5459</i>	FAX:	NAME: <i>Tim Van Meter</i>
EMAIL: <i>vanmeter_t@msn.com</i>		TITLE: <i>Owner</i>
ENGINEERING FIRM: <i>Roth Engineering Group</i>	ADDRESS: <i>7853 E. Arapahoe G. Suite 2500 Centennial, CO 80112</i>	CONTACT PERSON: <i>Kevin Roth</i>
PHONE: <i>303-841-9365</i>	FAX:	
EMAIL: <i>Kroth@rothengineering.com</i>		

Pre-Submittal Case Number: *Q14-082* Pre-Submittal Planner: *Molly Arkild-Larsen* Pre-Submittal Engineer: *Sarah White*

Parcel ID number: *1973-21-3-00-002*
 Address: *Quebec and Cherry Creek Dr*
 Subdivision Name: *unplatted*

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zoning:	<i>A-2</i>	<i>SH-POD MU-POD</i>
Project/Subdivision Name:	<i>cherry tree Estates PDP</i>	<i>cherry tree Estates PDP</i>
Site Area (Acres):	<i>10.6</i>	<i>10.6</i>
Floor Area Ratio (FAR):	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Density (Dwelling Units/Acre):		
Building Square Footage:	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Disturbed Area (Acres):	<i>N/A</i>	
Related Case Numbers: (Final/Preliminary Development Plan, Rezoning, and/or Plat)	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>

CASE TYPE

1041- Areas & Activities of State Interest	Location & Extent		Special District/Title
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preliminary Development Plan Special District/Title 30
1041- Areas & Activities of State Interest – Use by Special Review	Location & Extent – Major Amendment		Preliminary Development Plan – Major Amendment Special District/Title 32
Comprehensive Plan	Master Development Plan		Preliminary Plat Street Name Change
Final Development Plan	Master Development Plan – Major Amendment		Replat - Major Use by Special Review
Final Development Plan – Major Amendment	Minor Subdivision		Rural Cluster Use by Special Review – Major Amendment
Final Plat	Planned Sign Program		Rezoning Conventional Use by Special Review – Oil & Gas
Land Development Code Amendment	Planned Sign Program – Major Amendment		Rezoning Conventional – Major Amendment Vacation of Right-of-Way/Easement/Plat

ENG15-004

THIS SECTION FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Case No: *215-001* Planning Manager: *MOL* Engineering Manager: *Sarah W*
 Planning Fee: N \$ *500.00* Engineering Fee: N \$ *5,000* *SW*

This application shall be submitted with all applicable application fees. Submittal of this application does not establish a vested property right in accordance with C.R.S. 24-66-105(1). Processing and review of this application may require the submittal of additional information, subsequent reviews, and/or meetings, as outlined in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code.

RECEIVED
FEB 23 2015

Save Thumbdrive to G: drive

Cherry Tree Estates, LLC Senior Housing Community

January 30, 2015

Arapahoe County Planning Department
6924 S. Lima St.
Centennial, CO 80112
Attn: Molly Orkild-Larsen, Project Planner

RE: Cherry Tree Estates- Preliminary Development Plan Application

Dear Molly;

I am representing the owner of Cherry Tree Estates, Tim Van Meter, who is submitting a proposal for residential housing in the Four Square Mile Area of unincorporated Arapahoe County. Kevin Roth of Roth Engineering Group is the engineering firm hired to complete many components of this project. Mike Rocha is the traffic engineer who completed the required traffic impact study.

The site is located at the northeastern corner of S. Quebec St. and Cherry Creek Drive South. The property is a unique enclave of unincorporated Arapahoe County completely surrounded by the City of Denver. The property is unplatted and zoned A-2.

Tim Van Meter has owned the property since 2007 and has had four pre-application meetings in the preparation of the current proposal. A portion of the property was used as a dumping site and acquired by the City of Denver who operated the site as a land fill until the City closed the site in 1986. There are twenty four monitoring wells on the property operated by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE).

There is an existing 75 foot Xcel Energy overhead electrical power line crossing the property southeast-northwest. The easement covers approximately 2.8 acres on the site and the power line is 230 kv line. No structures are proposed within the easement.

The owner has spent significant time resolving these technical issues that have challenged this property as a result of this history. I am attaching a list of the technical issues and their current state of resolution as part of this application.

Proposal:

Tim Van Meter is proposing to rezone the property from A-2 to Senior House (SH-PUD) in order to build senior housing. Mr. Van Meter specializes in memory care and owns and operates a facility in Arvada called, Almost Like Home. He is proposing to build a combination of housing types to support seniors living with and without memory care challenges at this Arapahoe County location.

The project proposes two phases in order to build out the community. Phase 1 is 4.8 acres in size and includes Senior Homes with a density of 2.25 du/acre. Phase 2 is 5.8 acres and allows a density of 7.5 du/acres.

Senior homes are defined as homes that operate as a single family home in terms of having one kitchen facility and one or two living room areas, with bedrooms that house up to 16 persons. Residents require 24/7 supervision and consequently do not drive or live independently in terms of self-care such as, mobility, shopping, cooking or cleaning.

Phase 2 proposes a density of 7.5 du/acre which allows housing that may include attached housing or patio homes. The PDP defines the building heights, setback requirements, and distances between buildings for both phases as required by the Arapahoe County Land Development Code. Conceptual building footprints are provided for Phase 1 only because the proposal for this portion of the property is more defined at this time.

Background

The following list outlines background information and the current.

Property Description:

- a. The property is 10.6 acres in size and zoned A-2,
- b. The property is unplatted and created as a remnant parcel,
- c. The site is a triangular shape and surrounded by the City and County of Denver on all sides.

Surrounding Property Description:

Northern boundary:

- A single family residential subdivision platted as Indian Creek Filing No. 3, and
- A Denver park named Chennai Park is platted as part of Indian Creek Filing No. 1.

Southern boundary:

- The Cherry Creek runs the southern boundary of the property.

Western boundary:

- City and County of Denver property and S. Quebec Street.

Eastern boundary:

- A townhome subdivision platted as Granville West Filing No. 1.

Access:

The property was landlocked with no improved access. Mr. Van Meter has acquired an access permits from the property owners, City of Denver Public Works on the western boundary and the Parks Department on the eastern boundary. The western access is off of S. Quebec Street and the eastern access is off of Colorado Avenue. He has begun constructing the access drives in both locations. The S. Quebec Street access is the primary access and restricted to a right in, right out turning movement.

Time Line:

Cherry Tree Estates purchased the property	2007 Began working on major technical issues which are listed in the attached document.
Pre-application Meeting	2008
Pre-application Meeting	2011 Planning indicated that if the proposed density was between 1-12 du/ac then the application would comply, if not, then an amendment would be required.
Pre-application Meeting	April 3, 2014 Planning referred to owner to Julio Iturerrria for a determination on Subarea Plan compliance. A letter of compliance was issued by Planning in October of 2014.
Pre-application Meeting	November 20, 2014 As required by Planning, the project team addressed the full 10.6 acres of proposed development and received the necessary input for the PDP submittal.

Adjacent Neighbors:

In preparation for this rezoning proposal, the owner has worked extensively with adjacent property owners which is summarized below:

- a. The owners have met with individual property owners and attended HOA meetings since 2007 when they acquired the property.
- b. In September 2014, the owner met with the Four Square Mile Area Design Committee, representatives of the Granville HOA (eastern boundary) and attended a monthly meeting for the Concha HOA (northern boundary).
- c. During the time of a formal application, the owners plan on meeting with the HOA groups in order to inform them of the proposal and address any concerns or impacts they might have.

Subarea Plan Compliance

We met with Julio Iturria, Arapahoe County Long Range Planner, for a determination on whether or not the proposal complies with the Four Square Mile Area subarea plan of the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan. In October, 2014, Mr. Iturria submitted a letter summarizing his determination that the proposal complies with the Subarea Plan.

The Four Square Mile Area Plan defined this area as an Urban Service Area where services and infrastructure are available for urban levels of development. The Plan set forth goals and policies to encourage infill development that is compatible with surrounding land uses to take advantage of the available infrastructure and services. Furthermore, the Plan contemplated connectivity and continuity of the local and regional road network to minimize driving and trip generation.

The project site has high levels of connectivity for vehicles, pedestrian and bicycle riders from and to this property. Both a major arterial and a local street are available to serve this property through S. Quebec St. and Colorado Avenue where capacity for additional traffic generation exists based upon acquired access permit approvals. Transit users have access to RTD's bus system on S. Quebec Street. Cherry Creek provides a major regional trail connection for recreational users and bicycle commuters.

We believe this proposal is compatible with the surrounding residential development in terms of the use and scale. Specifically, Cherry Tree Estates proposes single story detached and attached residential homes which are bordered by residential neighborhoods comprised of two story single family homes in Indian Creek and townhomes in Granville West.

The *Four Square Mile Plan designation* for this property contemplated:

- a. 1-12 du/ac Single Family residential development, and
- b. A park site.

The *residential densities* could range as follows:

- a. Urban Residential (1-12 du/ac),
- b. Single Family Detached (1-6 du/ac), and
- c. Single Family Attached and Detached (6-12 du/ac).

The *residential uses* may include:

- a. Single family detached,
- b. Single family attached,
- c. Small multi-family homes, and
- d. Group homes within the residential category.

We believe that the Subarea Plan contemplates the attached housing and group home facilities Cherry Tree Estates proposes for this property. Furthermore, the densities of 2.25 du/ac and 7.5 du/acre fall easily within the range of 1 – 12 du/acre contemplated for

this site. Cherry Tree Estates proposes that the use and density are in compliance with the Subarea Plan as affirmed by Arapahoe County Planning.

Engineering:

The applicant has considered the drainage impacts of this development in a Phase 1 Drainage Report. The project will provide for storm water quality mitigation and detention capture, in accordance with County criteria.

The project is served by the East Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District (ECCV). The project will require a network of sanitary and domestic and fire flow water systems to serve the site. In order to bring water and sewer service to the site infrastructure will extend beyond the limits of the ECCV, jurisdictional; limits. The water main extensions will connect to the Denver Water network outside of the ECCV district limits and the Sanitary Sewer will connect to the Metro Wastewater Reclamation system outside of the ECCV network.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this proposal. I look forward to developing this project in Arapahoe County.

Sincerely,

Melissa Kendrick
Kendrick Consulting Inc.

PL

Molly

Cherry Tree Estates, LLC Senior Housing Community

November 6, 2015

Arapahoe County Planning Department
6924 S. Lima St.
Centennial, CO 80112
Attn: Molly Orkild-Larsen, Project Planner

RECEIVED

NOV 09 2015

ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PLANNING DIVISION

RE: Cherry Tree Estates- Phase 2 Review

Dear Molly;

On behalf of Cherry Tree Estates, I am submitting to you a revised PDP document for your review. In addition, we received comments from several agencies that I am addressing in this letter with attachments as applicable.

We have made some significant changes to the PDP based upon review of the County comments, input from the outside agencies and conversations with the homeowners associations. As detailed in this letter, we met with Concha and Granville West HOAs and the Four Square Mile association during this time. Based upon all of this input, we have revised the PDP as follows:

- 1) Reduced the **maximum building heights** in PA 1 from 35 feet to 32 feet and PA 2 from 45 feet to 42 feet.
- 2) Further restricted the **building height** in PA 1 to maximum of two story structures and PA 2 to a maximum of three story structures.
- 3) Added **Single Family Attached** residential to PA 1 without changing the overall density, building heights or setbacks.
- 4) Defined traffic calming measures to mitigate future cut-through traffic and address concerns from the neighborhoods about this issue.
- 5) Removed **Commercial Mobile Radio Facilities** to address concerns about cell towers.
- 6) Revised the **Project Narrative** and the **Architectural Character** note to refine how the residential project will be designed to address compatibility with the surrounding area. In particular, this has been achieved through statements about the project density, building massing and scale and building materials.

- 7) The **parking ratios** for assisted living facilities have been compared to other regulations in four jurisdictions. The summary document is attached for your review.

We believe these changes are significant ways to mitigate concerns related to building heights, traffic and commercial uses in the project.

Referral Comments:

1. Arapahoe County Planning

- Attached is a point-by-point response letter to your written comments. In addition, the revised PDP reflects changes made from the redlines. We believe we have satisfied your comments.
- You requested a narrative on how the application meets the PDP criteria. Attached is a memo addressing the criteria.

2. Arapahoe County Engineering

- Attached is a point-by-point response letter to the written comments, the revised drainage and traffic studies. We believe we have satisfied your comments.

3. Arapahoe County Mapping

- The revised PDP reflects the redline comments we received on the plan. We believe we have satisfied your comments.

4. Arapahoe County Open Spaces

- On August 18th we received a letter from ACOS requesting trail linkages on the property. On September 11th we received a revised letter removing this requirement. The owner has been in communication with representatives from the City of Denver who have indicated that there are plans for a future trail on the south side of the Cherry Creek on Denver property. This alignment will provide better access to a regional trail network.

5. Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District

- Submitted a will serve letter for the project.

6. Concha HOA

- Submitted a letter dated August 24th. Attached to this letter is our detailed response letter to their comments.
- In addition, the owner and his representatives have met with the HOA on September 30, 2014, August 11, 2015 and November 3, 2015. Tim VanMeter hosted 6-8 residents from Concha at his project in Arvada on October 18, 2014. Board representatives attended the Four Square Mile association meeting on September 9th and again on October 14th when we presented the project and they were very active in the discussion.

- We have made significant changes to the plans based upon our discussions with the HOA's. Those changes include but are not limited to the following:
 - 1) Reduced the building heights in PA 1 and 2,
 - 2) Restricted the building heights in PA 1 to two stories and in PA 2 to three stories,
 - 3) Defined traffic calming measures to address cut-through traffic concerns,
 - 4) Removed Commercial Mobile Radio Facilities to address concerns about cell towers.

7. Cunningham Fire Protection District

- The District submitted numerous comments that relate to the FDP process. The owner intends on complying with all District requirements.
- The District had a comment about emergency access through Granville West Subdivision on the eastern boundary. The owner has no plans to use this easement for emergency access. The site has two access points which are adequate for emergency services.

8. Denver Wastewater

- The agency stated they will not be serving the property and requested information on how the sanitary sewer connection will be designed. The CCVWD will be serving the property as indicated in their will serve letter. The project team will coordinate with Denver when the design is finalized.

9. Tri-County Health Department

- TCHD submitted comments related the landfill regulations. The owner has worked extensively with TCHD and Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE). Mr. Fonda Apostolopoulos, CDPHE, has submitted a response indicating that the owner has been and will be working with CDPHE in the clean-up process.

10. Xcel Energy Right-Of-Way department

- Xcel submitted two letters, the first letter on August 20th, indicated that the owner needed to work with the agency to address encroachments and development within the ROW. The owner has been working with Xcel throughout the ownership of the property so he called his contact in the agency to inform them of the letter. A second letter dated August 26th was submitted acknowledging that the owner has been working with the agency and requests that this coordination continue.

Agencies with no comments or concerns:

1. Arapahoe County Zoning
2. Cherry Creek Basin Water Quality Authority
3. Arapahoe County Library District
4. Arapahoe County Sheriff

Thank you for your time and continued effort on this project.

Sincerely,



Melissa Kendrick
Kendrick Consulting Inc.

Copy: Tim VanMeter, Owner
Kevin Roth, Roth Engineering Group
Larry Berkowitz, Spencer Fane Britt & Browne LLP

Attachments:

1. Parking Comparison
2. Planning Comments PBP Response
3. Concha HOA PBP Response
4. Memo Addressing PDP Criteria

Cherry Tree Estates, LLC

Senior Housing Community

November 3, 2015

RECEIVED

NOV 09 2015

ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PLANNING DIVISION

Arapahoe County Planning Department
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112
Attn: Molly Orkild-Larsen, Project Planner

Re: Z-15-001 Cherry Tree Estates – Preliminary Development Plan ("Cherry Tree Estates")

Dear Molly:

On behalf of Cherry Tree Estates ("CTE"), I am submitting the following response to the letter we received from Dean Foreman representing Concha HOA dated August 24, 2015. I have taken their letter verbatim and added our response to it. Therefore, "Request" is Concha's interpretation of the request CTE made during the Phase 1 review. Next is Concha's response to their first statement and then we have added a CTE response. Concha reviewed the Phase 1 submittal and subsequently, CTE has made some significant changes to the plans so some of the comments are dated. I am hoping this is a clear explanation.

Based upon the August 24th letter, the Concha representatives noted the following:

- Request:** The applicant was requested to indicate on the PUD that the height and density reflect the intent of the project as stated in its application letter of 1-30-15, namely "single story detached and attached residential homes". The community requested reduction in the 35'/45' height limits indicated and requested application of bulk planes along the common property border. (Note: Concha height limits are set to 28')

Concha Response: No indication of single story structures nor modification to the height limits were made nor were bulk plane restrictions made part of the PDP.

CTE Response: The height limits in the PDP have been revised so that Planning Area 1 is a maximum of 32 feet and two stories and Planning Area 2 is a maximum of 42 feet and no more than 3 stories in height.
- Request:** The applicant was requested to indicate on the PDP that the proposed density stated in the letters of intent match those on the language of the PDP (1.5 du/ac vs 2.25 for Planning Area 1, and 5.2 du/ac vs. 7.5 for Planning Area 2). This was based on (conceptual) plans originally provided indicating 7 buildings in Planning Area 1 and 30 duplex units for Planning Area 2. *The community expressed concerns that showing more density on the PDP than stated in letters of intent might lead to larger developments than proposed to date or that other developers could buy the rights to the development potential should this developer fail to construct his intended product (not uncommon)*

Concha Response: The PDP proposed densities have not changed. All references to actual construction were removed from site plans. No building footprints, street layouts, parking areas are indicated on the revised PDP. Maximum Lot Coverage by Structures equal to 50% was added to the Development Criteria and a Dwelling Unit category was added delineating 10 dwelling units per acre in Planning Area 1 and 43 dwelling units in Planning Area 2.

CTE Response: Details were removed based upon the County requirements to remove them. Maximum lot coverage was added as required by the County regulations. The dwelling units were added at the County's request.

- Request:** The applicant was requested to perform a full traffic impact analysis correctly reflecting the full build-out of the property for both Planning Areas, to clarify the resident, visitor and employee parking for both Planning Areas, and to clearly indicate the internal road will be made a private gated road, as indicated in meetings with the community. It was further requested that the full traffic study anticipate the additional traffic generated by a non-gated road allowing through traffic from Colorado Avenue to Quebec Street, and provide mitigation methods to relieve potential impacts at the Iowa/Quebec intersection. *The residents are concerned that the stated desire on the part of the applicant to create a gated private road, if not implemented, would lead to worsening traffic in the community and greater difficulty maneuvering the Iowa/Quebec intersection already experiencing peak traffic difficulties. The residents are also concerned that Quebec street improvements currently being envisioned by the City of Denver north of the project area are likely to exacerbate the poor LOS at the Quebec/Iowa intersection.*

Concha Response: A full traffic impact analysis was provided, however the analysis does not correctly identify the full buildout potential of either Planning Area; contradicts the Planning Area 1 employee space provision in the PUD Off Street Parking Requirements table of 2 employee spaces per building (which is also contradicted by the applicants' 7/23/15 letter indicating 4 employee spaces per building);

CTE Response: Traffic Impact Studies use the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual* to develop the traffic generated by a development. The *Trip Generation Manual* uses traffic count data from land uses and development sizes to estimate the number of trips that a development will generate. While parking is an important element of a site plan it is not considered in the generation of traffic for a development.

fails to consider traffic created by guests visiting the memory care facilities; appears to count 44 cars as the traffic impact of a full buildout in Planning Area 2 where the originally submitted PDP indicated a parking ratio of 2.25 spaces/unit;

CTE Response: The traffic generation rates provided are derived from national studies that consider the overall use of the development. The predicted volumes include all traffic generated by both residents, visiting guests, as well as postal vehicles, delivery vehicles, garbage trucks and any other traffic that accesses the development. Planning Area 2 assumes 44 Dwelling Units that will generate 256 trips Daily (128 trips in and 128 trips out) with 19 trips during the AM peak hour and 23 trips during the PM peak hour.

fails to take into consideration that 20% of the potential residents can be under 55 or temporary residents with potentially higher driving tendencies, and

CTE Response: The trip generation rates provided are derived from land uses that do in fact consider the age of the residents. Planning area 1 was designated as an assisted living facility and trips generated represent that type of use. Planning area 2 was designated as a Townhouse/Condominium facility and trips generated represent that type of use. The information provided in the national studies captures all trips. It is generally true that assisted living facilities generate fewer trips than other dwelling units, particularly during the peak hours.

fails to anticipate through traffic if the road is not made a private gated roadway (no provision is made in the PDP for gating the road). In fact, all references to roadways and curb cuts, including the already permitted Denver curb cuts, have been removed from the documents. In addition, since the project has been granted right-in-right-out only access onto Quebec, any employee, visitor, service or emergency vehicle or resident desiring to turn south on Quebec street – to access south Denver and the Tech Center, Cherry Creek Drive, Evans and I-25-- would be forced into the neighborhoods or would make a U-turn at Iowa, negatively impacting an intersection which has already been given an F Level of Service (LOS).

CTE Response: The provided study analyzed the east access as a standard access and not gated. The study anticipates very little traffic entering the neighborhood from the development. It is acknowledged that the Traffic Impact Study is based upon a conceptual plan. As the plans are finalized, the trips generated and the distribution of those trips may have to be revised to reflect actual development plans.

We do not believe the traffic impact analysis therefore properly represents the impact of the development. We note the applicant was granted curb cuts and road designs from the City of Denver without a land plan indicating its proposed use or full build-out potential. Normally curb cuts and roadway designs are determined from the actual uses anticipated.

CTE Response: The Traffic Impact Study was prepared to meet Arapahoe County's requirements for Traffic Impact Studies. In our opinion it does reflect the impact of the development traffic on the adjacent area. The traffic study was not done because of the Concha request. When Concha hires a professional traffic engineer to conduct a study we can compare findings. This study was not required by Arapahoe County. It was contracted by a qualified traffic engineer for the owner of the property.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to delineate how drainage between the subject Planning Area 1 buildings would be handled, and to delineate proposed sound and visual buffering from the Concha community. *The residents are concerned that the proposed project may not properly control drainage which has impacted residents along the north property line, and request landscape buffering from buildings with minimal internal separations.*

Concha Response: The PDP removed all references to buildings, drainage and topography and offered no response to the community concerns. Note: the applicants assured residents in a meeting that all site drainage would be "handled", but no indication of that was offered in the documents. No landscape requirements are included in the PDP.

CTE Response: Specific drainage solutions will be part of the FDP process. CTE will comply with all County regulations for drainage control.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify on the PDP documents that the internal road be made private and gated as stated in multiple meetings with the community.

Concha Response: No indication has been made on the PDP documents for a private gated road.

CTE Response: The PDP includes a Specific Note addresses Private Drives. After discussing this with County staff, we determined that language addressing traffic calming measures was the best approach to reduce or eliminate cut through traffic.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to reword the provision in the PDP Landscape Maintenance notes that "the adjacent property owners, Homeowners Associations or other entity besides Arapahoe County is responsible for maintenance and upkeep of perimeter fencing, landscaped areas, and sidewalks between the fence line and any paved roadways". It was requested that the applicant clearly indicate that adjacent neighboring property owners would NOT be responsible for upkeep of landscaped areas and sidewalks on the subject property. It was further requested that the applicant provide plans for perimeter fencing between the properties and to work with our community to determine the nature of the fencing and its maintenance.

Response: No changes were made to the Landscape Maintenance notes.

CTE Response: The notes are written by Arapahoe County and we are required to duplicate their language unless they approval otherwise.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to make clear in the PDP Drainage Master Plan notes that the subject property alone would be responsible for design and construction of drainage connecting systems resulting from its development, and that the Concha development would NOT be responsible for any such connections as the Concha development has already established drainage systems and, because the surrounding developments are in a different jurisdiction, could not be compelled to participate in such costs. *The residents are concerned that such notes might compel it to take part in mitigation of this development's impacts on drainage or maintenance of drainage facilities required for its construction.*

Concha Response: No changes were made to the Drainage Master Plan notes.

CTE Response: Same comment as previous bullet.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to confirm that it would comply with "Dark Skies" guidelines to ensure the projects' lighting would not exceed 0 footcandles at the common property line.

Concha Response: No mention of lighting limitations or application of "dark skies" was included.

CTE Response: The project will comply with the Arapahoe County Lighting regulations as required.

- Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify the age restrictions for the development and to stipulate that Planning Area 1 should be limited to memory care homes/facilities, and that Planning Area 2 should stipulate age restrictions.

Concha Response: The applicant modified the application from SH-PUD to MU-PUD and requested to forego Arapahoe County regulations for Senior Housing in favor of regulations under the Federal Housing for Older Persons Act (HOPA). Planning Area 1 development is limited to Assisted Living Residences, but Planning Area 2 uses have been expanded from housing for persons over 55, Memory Care Homes, and accessory uses to; Assisted Living residences, single family attached dwelling units, multi-family dwelling units, clubhouse, other appurtenant uses, home occupations and commercial radio facilities. *The community is concerned that the original stated intent of the project as "single story detached and attached residential homes" for the purpose of providing a "combination of housing types to support senior living with and without memory care challenges" has significantly expanded to include unrestricted multi family dwelling units (up to 20% is allowed by HOPA), commercial appurtenant uses and now commercial cell towers.* The addition of cell towers as an approved use is a concern as these facilities can be eyesores.

CTE Response: The uses identified have been refined or removed at the request of the County to be more specific. Cell towers were removed as an accessory use.
- Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify conflicting Off Street Parking requirements.

Concha Response: The July 23 letter of intent accompanying the proposal requests a variance from Arapahoe County off-street parking requirements for assisted living residences of 71 spaces for 7 buildings to 56 spaces for 7 buildings based on the "experience" of the developer. Yet the letter which indicates 4 employee spaces per building is contradicted by the PDP Off Street Parking Requirements for 2 employee spaces per building. The revised PDP also modified the Residential Housing off street parking requirements to indicate "per Land Development Code". A review of that code revealed that the code does not address parking requirements, thus leading to further confusion. The specific number of spaces for Residential Housing should be included in the PDP.

CTE Response: The specific standards were removed because the parking requirements will comply with the County regulations, but will vary depending upon whether the FDP proposes single family detached, attached or multi-family.
- Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify the architectural character of the proposal in light of the value of the adjoining residences averaging approximately \$300,000, and to show that materials and design meet the quality and character of our development. *The residents are concerned that a poor quality of construction and materials will lessen the value of its homes.*

Concha Response: All references to buildings, size, scale, form and materials have been removed from the PDP.

CTE Response: The Architectural Character note on sheet 1 of the PDP was revised to address this concern. The note includes specific materials that reflect the intent for building construction. Specific building materials will be identified with subsequent FDPs.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to limit hours of construction from 7:30-5:30 M-F, to limit non-emergency service vehicle hours to the same hours and to provide a bio-waste hazard disposal plan.

Concha Response: No response was provided.

CTE Response: There are no county requirements for either of the above- hours of construction or deliveries. We are unclear what is meant by the bio-waste hazard disposal plan. We have correspondence from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment that addresses the current status of the land fill mitigation. That documentation has been provided to the County.

Sincerely,



Melissa Kendrick
Kendrick Consulting Inc.
On behalf of Cherry Tree Estates

CC:

Lance Wheeland, President Concha HOA
Danielle Locquercio, Management & Maintenance
Kathi Burdess, Property manager for Granville HOA
Tim VanMeter, Cherry Tree Estates

SPENCER FANE
BRITT & BROWNE LLP
Attorneys & Counselors at Law

LARRY W. BERKOWITZ
DIRECT DIAL: (303) 839-3991
lberkowitz@spencerfane.com

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2015

May 12, 2015

ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PLANNING DIVISION

Molly Orkild-Larsen
Arapahoe County Planning Department
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial Colorado 80112

Re: Cherry Tree Estates

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larsen:

Recently, we were copied on a letter to you dated April 22, 2015 from Concha Townhouse Association ("Concha") regarding a "Preliminary Development Plan" for Cherry Tree Estates.

As you are aware, we have completed the Phase I review for the preliminary development plan for this development. This review is for internal staff in preparation for the Phase II review that goes to outside agencies and homeowners associations. The Phase I review has resulted in subsequent discussions with the planning staff and generated additional consideration and revision.

Many concerns and issues raised in the Concha Townhome Association letter will be addressed in the Phase II submission of the Preliminary Development Plan and our responses would normally follow that submission, however, we feel it necessary to clarify and respond to certain statements in the Concha letter as they are apparently based on serious misconceptions.

1. The applicant is proposing 35 foot building heights for Phase 1 (will be labeled Planning Area 1). The proposed building height is the same as the R-PSF Single Family designation in the Arapahoe County Zoning Regulations (which is the closest zoning category to what is being proposed). Bulk plane regulations have not been adopted in the County and are unnecessary for this development. The applicant has no intention to and will not build four story buildings. The next iteration of the PDP will demonstrate this height limit. The proposal of a ten foot height limit is not workable, feasible, or required. No such height restriction applies to any of the adjacent properties. In fact, the applicant intends a transitional buffer of lower height structures adjacent to existing single family residences to slightly taller structures, to the south of the power lines, further away from the existing residences.

2. Final density depends on future submittals and approvals, however in any event, the proposal of the applicant is and will be far below the maximum 12 D/use per acre as provided by the Four Square Mile Subarea Plan. The applicant intends to develop the project as a smart development consistent and in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood.

3. Concha has correctly pointed out an error in the traffic study waiver request. It incorrectly referenced an 84 unit assisted living facility. In fact, the Phase I development, that is the portion of the property north of the power lines will provide housing for up to 112 handicapped individuals (handicap in

1700 Lincoln Street, Suite 2000

Denver, Colorado 80203-4554

Denver 1239810.2

(303) 839-3800 www.spencerfane.com Fax (303) 839-3838

SPENCER FANE
BRITT & BROWNE LLP
Attorneys & Counselors at Law

Molly Orkild-Larsen
May 12, 2015
Page 2

the sense that they are all individuals suffering from Alzheimer's or dementia and need assistance with one or more daily life activities). While it is hoped that those residents will have visitors, none of the residents will drive.

The road from Colorado Avenue traversing through the site to Quebec is to remain private. It is intended that there will be restricted access on the Colorado Avenue side but not on the Quebec entrance.

4. The Concha letter states "some of our homeowners have been impacted by flow simply from the applicants grading of the site." We have no idea what this statement refers to. There has been no grading of the site within 500 feet of the Concha property line. While trash, dead trees, brush and leaves have been removed from the site, the grade, slope and elevation between the site and Concha has not changed. We understand that Concha has had a history of drainage issues and we were also told by a representative of Concha at the recent meeting that the sources of drainage concerns arises from the Grandville West development to the east of Concha. As one resident at the recent meeting with the HOA indicated he had been experiencing water in his basement for 12 years, it is obvious that whatever drainage issues are affecting Concha, have nothing to do with current activities on the Cherry Tree Estates site.

Grading and drainage of the site will be in accordance with County standards and will not adversely impact down-stream properties as required by the standards. Drainage issues will be reviewed as detailed plans are developed during the FDP phase of the project. This will afford all an opportunity to understand how drainage will be dealt with in the development of the Cherry Tree Estates property.

5. The applicant will abide by all applicable limitations on construction hours and non-emergency vehicles on the site.

We look forward to working with you and the adjacent homeowners associations as our plans develop.

Very Truly Yours,



Larry W. Berkowitz

LWB:cbw

cc: Tim VanMeter
Melissa Kendrick
Kevin Roth



Public Works and Development
 6924 S. Lima Street Centennial, Colorado 80112 Phone: 720-874-6650; FAX 720-874-6611
www.co.arapahoe.co.us

Planning Division
 Phase II Referral Routing

Case Number / Case Name:	Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates / Preliminary Development Plan
Planner:	Molly Orkild-Larson (MORKild-Larson@arapahoe.gov.com)
Engineer:	Sarah White
Date:	July 23, 2015
Date to be returned:	August 24, 2015

Arapahoe County Agencies		Citizen's Organizations	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessor / Arapahoe County	Karen Hart	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attorney / Arapahoe County	Robert Hill	<input type="checkbox"/> CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Building / Arapahoe County	Steve Byer	<input type="checkbox"/> CECON-(Within Centennial)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engineering / Arapahoe County	Sarah White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four Square mile Neighborhood
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mapping / Arapahoe County	Pat Hubert	<input type="checkbox"/> South Metro Chamber of Commerce
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County	Diane Kocis	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space / Arapahoe County	Shannon Carter	<input type="checkbox"/> Deer Trail Conservation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning / Arapahoe County	Molly Orkild-Larson	<input type="checkbox"/> West Arapahoe Conservation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sheriff / Arapahoe County	1 to Brian McKnight 1 to Glenn Thompson	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Weed Control / Arapahoe County	Russell Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/> CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning / Arapahoe County	Tammy King	<input type="checkbox"/> E-470 Authority
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RTD
			<input type="checkbox"/>
Referral Agencies		Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Architectural Review Committee		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Centurylink/Phone
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport or Military Base		<input type="checkbox"/> Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline
<input type="checkbox"/>	CGS Colorado Geological Survey-Soils		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> XCEL
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Denver		<input type="checkbox"/> IREA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Colorado Parks and Wildlife		
<input type="checkbox"/>	County		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	School	Cherry Creek #5	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire District	Cunningham	<input type="checkbox"/> ACWWA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Metro District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Post Office Growth Coordinator	Jaimie Hernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCBWQA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reap I-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership		<input type="checkbox"/> Colorado Division of Water Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Park District	Lynn Cornell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEMSWA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Library District	Janel Maccarrone	<input type="checkbox"/> ECCVW&S
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban Drainage
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tri-County	Sheila Lynch	<input type="checkbox"/> Other / 5 Sets East End Adv. Committee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOA/Homeowners Associations	Concha Townhome Association	Park at Indian Creek
		Cook Park Neighborhood Association	Granville West Hoa

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

COMMENTS:	SIGNATURE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted	<i>See headlines & letter dated 8/24/15.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Have the following comments to make related to the case:	



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

Public Works and Development

6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, Colorado 80112-3853
Phone: 720-874-6500
Fax: 720-874-6611
TDD: 720-874-6574
www.arapahoegov.com
publicworks@arapahoegov.com

DAVID M. SCHMIT, P.E.
Director

Planning Comments – Phase II
Case Number: Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates
Preliminary Development Plan
August 24, 2015

Sheet 1 – Cover Sheet

1. Remove Note or Notes after the titles under Standard Notes.
2. The Four Square Mile Area note needs to be placed under Specific Notes.
3. Under Specific Notes, Age Restriction, Note #2, the “Person under the age-minimum may reside in the community temporarily for up to 90 days per year *if an exemption is granted?*”
4. Under the Project Narrative and Architectural Character, what do you mean by “lower scale” found in the second paragraph? One story?
5. Under the Project Narrative, first paragraph, what Secretary issues the rules? Please clarify.
6. Check spelling under Project Narrative.
7. What does “corresponding variations” mean under Architectural Character? Please clarify.
8. Add a line for the month under the Board of County Commissioners Approval signature block.
9. Move the address to in front of “My Commission Expires” under the Certificate of Ownership signature block.
10. See the comments on du/ac on sheet 2.

Sheet 2 – Site Plan

1. See comments on this sheet.
2. The comments on the Development Criteria chart are as follows:
 - You need to be more specific of what accessory uses you’re proposing.
 - Are you looking at putting CRMS facilities on the towers?
 - Du/ac calculations are off, please revise.
 - Revise the side to another side dimension. Talk to the building department if you need further clarification.
 - Provide clarification on the internal lot line dimensions.
3. Add additional information for each of the planning areas as indicated on the site plan.



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

Public Works and Development

6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, Colorado 80112-3853
Phone: 720-874-6500
Fax: 720-874-6611
TDD: 720-874-6574
www.arapahoegov.com
publicworks@arapahoegov.com

DAVID M. SCHMIT, P.E.
Director

Planning Comments – Phase II
Case Number: Z15-001, Cheery Tree Estates
Preliminary Development Plan
August 24, 2015

Sheet 1 – Cover Sheet

1. See comments on this sheet.

Sheet 2 – Site Plan

1. See comments on this sheet.

MISSION

Enhancing your quality of life through exceptional delivery of services and efficient use of public funds.

Engineering Services Division Staff Report

Date: November 30, 2015
To: Cherry Tree Estates, LLC
CC: Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Planning Division
From: Sarah White, Case Engineer, Engineering Services Division
Project Name: Cherry Tree Estate
Case Number: Z15-001

The Engineering Services Division (ESD) has completed review for the above referenced project. ESD has reviewed the documents provided with the resubmittal of this project and provides the following comments:

1. Arapahoe County and Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority (SEMSWA) have no further comments in relation to the Phase I Drainage Report.
2. SEMSWA has issued a Memorandum of Design Approval for Stormwater Facilities. (see attached)
3. The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is missing the TIS Content Checklist. The response to comments stated that the checklist was provided, however it was not. The TIS will be acceptable to the County with the addition of a completed, signed and sealed TIS Content Checklist included as part of the Traffic Impact Study.
4. The Drainage Report and TIS may be submitted for Final Approval.
5. Applicant may need to address any remaining comments on the PDP check prints. Please confirm status of checkprints and/or Mylar with Planning Department.

FINAL SUBMITTAL PROCEDURE - Attached to this report is an instruction checklist to the applicant regarding resubmittal of documents. The number of documents also includes documents requested by SEMSWA. Staff will forward the applicable documents; please do not submit directly to SEMSWA. The applicant and their consultants must follow these instructions to avoid delays in processing of this case.

Cc: *Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division, Division Manager*
Case File No. Z15-001

Final Submittal CHECKLIST

Please confirm the following finalized documents items are submitted:

	Engineering Documents Required with the Formal Phase II Referral Submittal to the County Planning Division	Needed Copies
X	A copy of this final submittal Checklist	1
X	Completed Review and Approval Form (Arapahoe County Form 581) available on-line at http://www.arapahoegov.com/index.aspx?NID=569	1
X	Traffic Impact Study	3 + 1 digital
X	Phase I Drainage Study	5 + 1 digital
	Phase II Drainage Study	
	Phase III Drainage Study	
	Drainage Letter of Conformance	
	Operations & Maintenance Manual	
	Preliminary Construction Drawings	
	Construction Drawings	
	Pavement Design Report	
	Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control (GESC) documents	
	Legal Description and Exhibit	
	Legal name, legal address, and title (if any) of the Owner, assign, or person with signatory authority on behalf of the Owner	

Case No. Z15-001

Case Engineer: Sarah White

Final Submittal Requirements:

Once plans and/or reports have been accepted for approval by the Engineering Division, the Applicant's representative shall submit to the Engineering Department a minimum of five (5) sets of blackline copies of the Drainage Report and three (3) sets of the Traffic Impact Study. All sets must be signed and stamped by a Professional Engineer, registered in the State of Colorado. The Engineering Division will approve Construction Plans and/or Reports by signing all submitted sets. **Two (2) set of signed plans/reports will be returned to the Applicant.** The representative may also submit additional signed sets of Construction Plan and/or Report blacklines to be approved and signed by the Engineering Division for use by the, owner / developer, consultant, contractors, etc. Arapahoe County will not approve copies that have not been signed and stamped by a professional engineer, as applicable.



Public Works and Development

6924 S. Lima Street Centennial, Colorado 80112 Phone: 720-874-6650; FAX 720-874-6611

www.co.arapahoe.co.us

Planning Division

Phase II Referral Routing

Case Number / Case Name:	Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates / Preliminary Development Plan
Planner:	Molly Orkild-Larson (MOrkild-Larson@arapahoegov.com)
Engineer:	Sarah White
Date:	December 10, 2015
Date to be returned:	December 23, 2015

Arapahoe County Agencies		Citizen's Organizations		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessor / Arapahoe County	Karen Hart		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attorney / Arapahoe County	Robert Hill	<input type="checkbox"/> CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Long Range Planning – Arapahoe County	Julio Iturreria	<input type="checkbox"/> CECON-(Within Centennial)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engineering / Arapahoe County	Sarah White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four Square mile Neighborhood	Mark Lampert
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mapping / Arapahoe County	Pat Hubert	<input type="checkbox"/> South Metro Chamber of Commerce	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County	Diane Kocis	Conservation District	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space / Arapahoe County	Shannon Carter	<input type="checkbox"/> Deer Trail Conservation District	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning / Arapahoe County	Molly Orkild-Larson	<input type="checkbox"/> West Arapahoe Conservation District	Tasha Chevarria
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sheriff / Arapahoe County	1 to Brian McKnight 1 to Glenn Thompson	Transportation	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Weed Control / Arapahoe County	Russell Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/> CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1	Rick Solomon
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning / Arapahoe County	Tammy King	<input type="checkbox"/> E-470 Authority	Peggy Davenport
Referral Agencies			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RTD	Chris Quinn
<input type="checkbox"/>	Architectural Review Committee		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport or Military Base		Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone	
<input type="checkbox"/>	CGS Colorado Geological Survey-Soils		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Centurylink/Phone	Charles Place
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Denver		<input type="checkbox"/> Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Colorado Parks and Wildlife		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> XCEL	Donna George
<input type="checkbox"/>	County		<input type="checkbox"/> IREA	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	School	Cherry Creek #5	Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire District	Cunningham	<input type="checkbox"/> ACWWA	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Metro District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer	Kiel Downing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Post Office Growth Coordinator	Jaimie Hernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCBWQA	Chuck Reid
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reap I-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership		<input type="checkbox"/> Colorado Division of Water Resources	Joanne Williams
<input type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Park District	Lynn Cornell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEMSWA	Paul Danley
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Library District	Janel Maccarrone	<input type="checkbox"/> ECCVW&S	Chris Douglass
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban Drainage	David Mallory
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tri-County	Sheila Lynch	<input type="checkbox"/> Other / 5 Sets East End Adv. Committee	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HOA/Homeowners Associations		Concha Townhome Association	Park at Indian Creek	
		Cook Park Neighborhood Association	Granville West Hoa	

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

COMMENTS:	SIGNATURE
<input type="checkbox"/> Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have the following comments to make related to the case:	
See Attached Memo	

December 14, 2015

To: Molly Orkild-Larson, Case Manager

From: Julio Iturreria, Long Range Planning Manager

Subject: Revised Cherry Tree Estates Referral Comments
for Z15-001

The Cherry Tree Estates from the being was discussed as a memory care facilities in Phase 1 which would care as assisting living for the community. Phase 2 would be a continuation of the same intent with “propose (d) a Senior Housing zoning designation for this property.” Quote from Letter dated November 14, 2014 from Ms. Melissa Kendrick of Kendrick Consulting Inc.

At the Four Square Mile Neighborhood meeting which to place on December 9, 2015, I noticed the latest proposal map which I borrowed from an attendee and noticed that is was different than what was presented a year ago. It appears that wording had change to include “multi-family” as a permitted use. A long with this discovery the designation for Senior Housing Zoning was missing. This new proposed of Multi-Family goes against the existing Four Square Mile SubArea Plan. The existing subarea plan shows this parcel as being Single Family Detached with a 1-12 dwelling unit per acre.

As per page 5 of the Appendix Section of the Four Square Mile SubArea Plan states:

SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED –

Primary uses are:

Detached Single Family dwellings on individual lots with direct or shared access to public streets. Secondary uses are:

Parks and recreation facilities, public and private schools, places of worship, and neighborhood commercial uses subject to locational, height, bulk and scale considerations. The dwellings will have central water and sanitary sewer service and the streets are paved. Development density: One to six dwelling units per gross acre. The Single Family Detached land use designation density is further defined on the Land Use Map.

SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED AND ATTACHED – Primary uses are Detached Single Family dwellings on smaller individual lots and/ or Single Family Attached dwellings with direct or shared access to public streets. The smaller lot and attached dwellings provide common open space for the development as well as some individual dwelling unit open space in the form or

yards and patios, Vehicle parking is intended to be in individual garages and in on-site parking bays. Secondary uses can include recreational facilities, limited convenience commercial uses and quasi-public uses such as schools and places of worship. Development density is from six to 12 dwelling units per gross acre.

However, Multi-Family is not an optional category and unacceptable:

MULTI FAMILY – Primary uses are: Multi Family residential structures including apartments, cooperatives, and condominium dwelling units with shared or designated on-site parking, open space and recreation facilities for residents.

Secondary uses are:

Neighborhood Commercial centers, parks and recreation facilities, schools, both public and private, and places of worship. Development density: From 13 to 25 dwelling units per gross acre.

Therefore, based upon the recent referral from Current Planning, as the Long Range Planning Staff the category of Multi-Family use is not in compliance with the SubArea Plan should be deleted.

If the applicant wishes to proceed without eliminating the category of Multi-Family, recommendation for this project is **denial** since this application is no longer compliant with the existing Four Square Mile SubArea Plan.



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

September 30, 2014

Mr. Tim VanMeter
Cherry Tree Estates, LLC
Senior Housing Community

RE: Cherry Tree Estates Proposal

Dear Mr. VanMeter;

Thank you for your letter explaining your position on the proposal for a memory care facility with a site plan. Since the Subarea plan for the Four Square Mile Area does not recognize any group homes or assisted facilities. And it is not the intent of the subarea plan to have specific categories such as assisted living, etc. Therefore I have determined that this request for an amendment is not warranted for the Four Square Mile Area plan, or the need for the informal Planning Commission discussion. Since the Residential category allows for such uses. Moreover, my decision opens the door for you to proceed to the application for a zone change with the knowledge that amendment is not necessary. However, the site plan shows an administrative building, and the intended use is still vague which is understandable for your request. So as long as the administrative building is an accessory to the memory care facility, there should not be a problem.

I will go before the Planning Commission and discuss my rationale and conclusion.

Your letter with Background information, Subarea Plan Compliance, Density, Group A and B discussion helped considerably to expedite your request for a decision.

Congratulations,

Julio G. Iturreria
Long Range Planning Manager
6924 S Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112
720-874-6657 (direct)
jiturreria@arapahoegov.com



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

Cc: Planning Commissioners
Jan Yeckes, Planning Manager

6924 South Lima Street | Centennial, CO 80112

720-874-6500 Main | 720-874-6611 Fax | 720-874-6574 TDD | www.co.arapahoe.co.us

Building
720-874-6600

Engineering Services
720-874-6500

Support Services
720-874-6500

Transportation
720-874-6500

Planning
720-874-6650

Road and Bridge
720-874-6820



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PROTECT. CONNECT. ENJOY.

September 11, 2015

Molly Orkild-Larsen
Public Works and Development
6924 S. Lima Street
Centennial CO, 80112

RE: Planning Case # Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan – Phase 1.

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larsen:

After meeting with Planning Staff, the Arapahoe County Open Spaces Department has a better understanding of the project details. We have a better sense of the property use and the need for safety and privacy of the memory patients. Therefore, at this time the Open Spaces Department has no comments regarding case #Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan- Phase 1.

Thank you,

Ray Winn,

Open Spaces Planner



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PROTECT. CONNECT. ENJOY.

August 18, 2015

Molly Orkild-Larsen
Public Works and Development
6924 S. Lima Street
Centennial CO, 80112

RE: Planning Case # Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan – Phase 1.

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larsen:

The Arapahoe County Open Spaces Dept. has reviewed the submittal by Kendrick Consulting for the preliminary development plan. Open Spaces has the following comments and recommendations for approval:

Open Spaces is actively involved in management and providing access to the Cherry Creek Trail. The Cherry Creek Trail is an important asset for future residents of this development, to the surrounding community, and to the entire Front Range as a regional multi-use trail. The Cherry Creek Trail provides recreation and alternative transportation to thousands of users, including future residents of the proposed development. The property is an island of Unincorporated Arapahoe County, surrounded by the City of Denver, it is essential to coordinate development with the immediate surrounding area. Access to the Cherry Creek Trail is lacking, especially for residents on the north and east side of the proposed development due to the trail located on the south side of the river. Aerial photography indicates that there are already several established social trails traveling east to west along the southern edge of the property.

As noted in the submittal, the two access points to the development are S. Quebec Street in the western boundary of the property and E. Colorado Avenue on the East Side. The preliminary development plan also notes that a private drive loops through the property from these two access locations. These two access points when connected would provide a critical link from the surrounding neighborhood on the east of the development to the Cherry Creek Trail and adjacent parkland. Providing this link and connectivity would work to implement Goals of the 2005 Four Square Mile Sub-Area Plan:

Goal:

Make the natural assets of the High Line Canal Trail and the Cherry Creek Trail a part of the community identity for walkable communities and the potential for improved public health through walking, bicycle, and horseback riding activities.

Strategy:

Consider improvements to trail access at all public street crossings and access points. Work with the Highland Canal Preservation group to encourage and improve trail identity, connectivity, usability, and safety.

Goal:

Increase the usability and access to the Cherry Creek Trail and the High Line Canal Trail from the Four Square Mile Area neighborhoods by improving pedestrian and bicycle access to the trails.



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PROTECT. CONNECT. ENJOY.

Policy:

Develop a trails access plan that opens the adjacent neighborhoods to the trails, whenever possible. Look at the potential for improved trail access at all public street crossings of the trails.

Open Space recommends creating at minimum an 8' sidewalk connection along the southern edge of the property as well as along the entrances to the proposed development for public use, providing a much needed trail connection. This connection may assist working with Denver Public Works to facilitate access and circulation and the necessary curb cuts.

Open Spaces Dept. is willing to further discuss this recommendation with applicant and assist in any way we can.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application.

Ray Winn,

Open Spaces Planner
Cc Roger Harvey: Planning Administrator



Public Works and Development
 6924 S. Lima Street Centennial, Colorado 80112 Phone: 720-874-6650; FAX 720-874-6611
www.co.arapahoe.co.us

Planning Division
Phase II Referral Routing

Case Number / Case Name:	Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates / Preliminary Development Plan
Planner:	Molly Orkild-Larson (MOrkild-Larson@arapahoe.gov.com)
Engineer:	Sarah White
Date:	July 23, 2015
Date to be returned:	August 24, 2015

Arapahoe County Agencies		Citizen's Organizations	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessor / Arapahoe County	Karen Hart	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attorney / Arapahoe County	Robert Hill	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Building / Arapahoe County	Steve Byer	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engineering / Arapahoe County	Sarah White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mapping / Arapahoe County	Pat Hubert	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County	Diane Kocis	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space / Arapahoe County	Shannon Carter	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning / Arapahoe County	Molly Orkild-Larson	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sheriff / Arapahoe County	1 to Brian McKnight 1 to Glenn Thompson	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Weed Control / Arapahoe County	Russell Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning / Arapahoe County	Tammy King	<input type="checkbox"/>
Referral Agencies			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Architectural Review Committee		<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport or Military Base		
<input type="checkbox"/>	CGS Colorado Geological Survey-Soils		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Denver		<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Colorado Parks and Wildlife		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	County		<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	School	Cherry Creek #5	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire District	Cunningham	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Metro District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Post Office Growth Coordinator	Jaimie Hernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reap I-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership		<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Park District	Lynn Cornell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Library District	Janel Maccarrone	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tri-County	Sheila Lynch	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOA/Homeowners Associations	Concha Townhome Association	
		Park at Indian Creek	
		Cook Park Neighborhood Association	
		Granville West Hoa	

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

COMMENTS:	SIGNATURE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted	<i>MM - Jul 27, 2015</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Have the following comments to make related to the case:	



Public Works and Development

6924 S. Lima Street Centennial, Colorado 80112 Phone: 720-874-6650; FAX 720-874-6651
www.co.arapahoe.co.us

Planning Division
 Phase II Referral Routing

RECEIVED

AUG 03 2015

ARAPAHOE COUNTY
 PLANNING DIVISION

Case Number / Case Name:	Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates / Preliminary Development Plan
Planner:	Molly Orkild-Larson (MOrkild-Larson@arapahoegov.com)
Engineer:	Sarah White
Date:	July 23, 2015
Date to be returned:	August 24, 2015

Arapahoe County Agencies		Citizen's Organizations	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessor / Arapahoe County	Karen Hart	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attorney / Arapahoe County	Robert Hill	<input type="checkbox"/> CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Building / Arapahoe County	Steve Byer	<input type="checkbox"/> CECON-(Within Centennial)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engineering / Arapahoe County	Sarah White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four Square mile Neighborhood
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mapping / Arapahoe County	Pat Hubert	<input type="checkbox"/> South Metro Chamber of Commerce
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County	Diane Kocis	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space / Arapahoe County	Shannon Carter	<input type="checkbox"/> Deer Trail Conservation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning / Arapahoe County	Molly Orkild-Larson	<input type="checkbox"/> West Arapahoe Conservation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sheriff / Arapahoe County	1 to Brian McKnight 1 to Glenn Thompson	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Weed Control / Arapahoe County	Russell Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/> CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning / Arapahoe County	Tammy King	<input type="checkbox"/> E-470 Authority
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RTD
			<input type="checkbox"/>
Referral Agencies		Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Architectural Review Committee		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Centurylink/Phone
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport or Military Base		<input type="checkbox"/> Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline
<input type="checkbox"/>	CGS Colorado Geological Survey-Soils		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> XCEL
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Denver		<input type="checkbox"/> IREA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Colorado Parks and Wildlife		
<input type="checkbox"/>	County		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	School	Cherry Creek #5	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire District	Cunningham	<input type="checkbox"/> ACWWA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Metro District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Post Office Growth Coordinator	Jaimie Hernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCBWQA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reap I-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership		<input type="checkbox"/> Colorado Division of Water Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Park District	Lynn Cornell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEMSWA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Library District	Janel Maccarrone	<input type="checkbox"/> ECCVW&S
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban Drainage
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tri-County	Sheila Lynch	<input type="checkbox"/> Other / 5 Sets East End Adv. Committee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOA/Homeowners Associations	Concha Townhome Association	Park at Indian Creek
		Cook Park Neighborhood Association	Granville West Hoa

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

	<i>Additional</i>	COMMENTS:	SIGNATURE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted	<i>Chris B. King</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>		Have the following comments to make related to the case:	



Public Works and Development

6924 S. Lima Street Centennial, Colorado 80112 Phone: 720-874-6650; FAX 720-874-6611

www.co.arapahoe.co.us

Planning Division

Phase II Referral Routing

Case Number / Case Name:	Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates / Preliminary Development Plan
Planner:	Molly Orkild-Larson (MOrkild-Larson@arapahoegov.com)
Engineer:	Sarah White
Date:	July 23, 2015
Date to be returned:	August 24, 2015

Arapahoe County Agencies		Citizen's Organizations	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessor / Arapahoe County	Karen Hart	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attorney / Arapahoe County	Robert Hill	<input type="checkbox"/> CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Building / Arapahoe County	Steve Byer	<input type="checkbox"/> CECON-(Within Centennial)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engineering / Arapahoe County	Sarah White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four Square mile Neighborhood
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mapping / Arapahoe County	Pat Hubert	<input type="checkbox"/> South Metro Chamber of Commerce
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County	Diane Kocis	Conservation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space / Arapahoe County	Shannon Carter	<input type="checkbox"/> Deer Trail Conservation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning / Arapahoe County	Molly Orkild-Larson	<input type="checkbox"/> West Arapahoe Conservation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sheriff / Arapahoe County	1 to Brian McKnight 1 to Glenn Thompson	Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Weed Control / Arapahoe County	Russell Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/> CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning / Arapahoe County	Tammy King	<input type="checkbox"/> E-470 Authority
Referral Agencies			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RTD
<input type="checkbox"/>	Architectural Review Committee		<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport or Military Base		Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone
<input type="checkbox"/>	OGS Colorado Geological Survey-Soils		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Centurylink/Phone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Denver		<input type="checkbox"/> Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline
<input type="checkbox"/>	Colorado Parks and Wildlife		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> XCEL
<input type="checkbox"/>	County		<input type="checkbox"/> IREA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	School	Cherry Creek #5	Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire District	Cunningham	<input type="checkbox"/> ACWWA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Metro District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Post Office Growth Coordinator	Jaimie Hernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCBWQA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reap I-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership		<input type="checkbox"/> Colorado Division of Water Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Park District	Lynn Cornell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEMSWA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arapahoe Library District	Jenet Maccarrone	<input type="checkbox"/> ECCW&S
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special District		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban Drainage
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tri-County	Shella Lynch	<input type="checkbox"/> Other / 5 Sets East End Adv. Committee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOA/Homeowners Associations	Concha Townhome Association	Park at Indian Creek
		Cook Park Neighborhood Association	Granville West Hoa

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

COMMENTS:		SIGNATURE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted	<i>M. Janet Maccarrone</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Have the following comments to make related to the case:	

Molly Orkild-Larson

Subject: FW: Cherry Tree Estates

From: Marron, Brenden S - PWWMD Wastewater Management [<mailto:Brenden.Marron@denvergov.org>]

Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 3:17 PM

To: Sarah White

Cc: Hamer, Jeremy - PWRWS ERA

Subject: RE: Cherry Tree Estates

Hi Sarah,

Based on the information provided Denver Wastewater does not have any comments at this time. Prior to the final drainage report for the pond being approved can you send over a copy to ensure it is in general agreement with the outfall currently being constructed?

Secondly, once you have a plan indicating how the site will be served by sanitary can you send a copy over? As of right now Denver has no intention of serving the development, but there is communication with Metro Wastewater. Metro required additional information prior to making a commitment of service, but this information has not yet been provided.

If you have any questions let me know.

Regards,
Brenden



Brenden Marron

Development Services | City and County of Denver

201 W. Colfax Avenue, Dept 507, Denver, Colorado 80202

720.913.1757 Phone | 720.865.3280 Fax

Brenden.Marron@Denvergov.org | [Dial 3-1-1 for City Services](#)



CUNNINGHAM FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

2015 SOUTH DAYTON STREET ♦ DENVER, CO 80247 ♦ Phone: (303) 755-9202
Fax: (303) 337-7971

PDP Comment

August 19, 2015

Molly Orkild-Larson
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 S. Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Re: Case Cherry Tree Estates-PDP

The Fire District has reviewed the referral for the above referenced case for compliance with the *2009 International Fire Code (IFC)* as adopted by the District. The Fire District supports the PDP for approval with the following comments.

Fire District comments for FDP

The Fire District requires that the following general comments are to be included on the cover sheet of the FDP:

1. Surfaced access roads capable of withstanding the imposed loads of fire apparatus and all required hydrants shall be installed prior to construction.
2. All roads and drives are hereby designated as fire lanes. When required by the Fire District, all fire lanes shall be posted "No Parking – Fire Lane." All fire lanes shall be included in the *Arapahoe County program* for enforcement of private property parking.
3. Complete specifications and building construction plans shall be submitted to the Fire District for review and approval prior to any building construction occurring.

4. All fire hydrants are to be installed in conformance with *Sections 507* of the *2009 International Fire Code*. No landscaping, fencing or any other obstruction shall be placed within three feet of a fire hydrant.
5. The Fire District requires that IF new traffic signals are installed as a result of new development are equipped with Opticom traffic signal prioritization equipment. The developer shall ensure that traffic signal prioritization equipment is provided at the time new traffic signals are installed.

1. Fire lane designation

All private drives within this development are declared as fire apparatus access under *Section 503 of the 2009 IFC*.

2. Fire lane identification

The Fire District declares all drives within this development as fire apparatus access under *Section 503* of the *2009 IFC*. Any roadway that is 30-feet or less in width shall be marked as a fire lane on both sides; roadways 30-34 feet in width shall be marked as a fire lane on one side. Information on the *Arapahoe County Fire Lane Program* will be provided to the Developer.

3. Fire lane plan

Fire lane plan and radii for apparatus within the site is required for approval.

4. Water plan

A formal water plan for review and approval is required for any new fire hydrant installations and the fire service line prior to issuance of any Fire District building permits. Submittal of a copy of the water plan submitted to the *Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District (CCVWSD)* during their required approval process directly to the Fire District for review is acceptable.

5. Building construction plans

Complete specifications and building construction plans shall be submitted directly to the Fire District for review and approval at the same time plans are submitted to the building department and prior to any building construction occurring. The developer is encouraged contact Fire Prevention to verify plan submittal requirements and permit fees prior to plans submittal.

6. Fire Sprinkler System

The installation of a fire sprinkler system is required. The sprinkler system shall meet the requirements of *National Fire Protection Association standard NFPA 13, Installation of Sprinkler Systems*.

7. Fire Alarm System

The installation of an approved fire alarm system is required. The fire alarm system shall meet the requirements of *National Fire Protection Association standard NFPA 72, National Fire Alarm Code*.

8. Radio Amplification System

The installation of an approved radio amplification system shall meet the requirements of *Appendix J of the International Fire Code*.

If you need any additional information or have any questions, please contact me at (303) 338-4204. The Fire Prevention Bureau fax number is (303) 337-7971.

Sincerely,

Tyler Everitt
Deputy Fire Marshal



CUNNINGHAM FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

2015 SOUTH DAYTON STREET ♦ DENVER, CO 80247 ♦ Phone: (303) 755-9202
Fax: (303) 752-1857

VIA FACSIMILE

March 17, 2014

Senior Engineer Tim Nuetzel
2000 S. Colorado Boulevard Suite 6000
Denver, CO 80222

Re: Cherry Tree Estates/Cunningham Fire Protection Project #14-529

Mr. Nuetzel:

This letter is provided to clarify the requirements for access to the development you're client is proposing as the Cherry Tree Estates development near the intersection of E. Iowa Avenue and S. Quebec Street. The Cunningham Fire Protection District has reviewed the two points of access serviced through the City of Denver. The two points of access have been reviewed one from S. Quebec Street and one access point from E. Colorado Avenue.

The plans also indicate an emergency access in the Granville West Subdivision north of the power lines on the border between Arapahoe County and the City of Denver. Cunningham Fire Protection District has reasons to believe this access identified is for the Denver Fire Department to service the existing townhomes in the Granville West Subdivision and is not considered a part of the Cherry Tree Estate project.

The Fire District has adopted the *2009 International Fire Code (IFC)* as the model fire code. The adoption of this code also includes adoption of *Appendix D* which specifies requirements for fire apparatus access roads and fire lane signage.

Two separate points of access are required for the development you are proposing. *Section 503* of the *2009 IFC* authorizes the Fire District to require additional fire apparatus access when there is a potential for impairment of single access road by vehicle congestion or other factors that could limit access. Additionally, *Section D106* of the *2009 IFC* requires that multiple family residential developments must have two separate points of access when there are more than 100 dwelling units. At build out your development will exceed this number potentially with the type of development proposed?

The Cunningham Fire Protection District will support the two points of access S. Quebec Street & E. Colorado Avenue. The two accesses shall meet the fire apparatus access road and fire lane designation requirements:

- All of the primary fire apparatus access roads shall be installed prior to construction. The access roads must be an all weather surface and able to support an imposed load of 75,000 pounds.
- Fire lane designation
The Fire District declares all drives within this development as fire apparatus access under *Section 503.3* of the 2009 *IFC*. Any roadway that is 30-feet or less in width shall be marked as a fire lane on both sides; roadways 30-34 feet in width shall be marked as a fire lane on one side. (The proposed access of 25 feet will require both sides of the access to be marked with fire lane signage)
- A fire lane signage plan and a letter requesting inclusion into the County fire lane program is required to be submitted to the Fire District for review and approval at the construction phase. Information on the Arapahoe County Fire Lane Program will be provided to the Developer.
- The fire lane signs in the access portion of the road in the City of Denver shall also be enforceable by the Denver Police Department.

This approval does not waive any requirements set forth by the Arapahoe County Public Works and Development or the City of Denver Public works and Development or any other entities/agency requirements. This approval is for the Cunningham Fire Protection District as the service provider to this parcel in Arapahoe County.

Please let me know if you need additional information or further clarification. I can be contacted at (303) 338-4222.

Sincerely,

Tim Cox
Fire Marshal

CC: CFPD Project files #14-529

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Strohfus, David <dstrohfus@CherryCreekSchools.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2016 12:40 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: RE: Cherry Tree Estates - Preliminary Development Plan

**Molly,
I'll work to get you a response quickly. We're up to our eyeballs here with potential bond planning, but I'll do my best.**

Simply put – no cash in lieu will be necessary at this time (of course). We will simply include our customary response for a development like this that would state that if the property shift at some point in the future to include residents that might sent students to CCSD, we would ask for an appropriate fee at that time.

Thanks!

David Strohfus

**Director of Planning and Interagency Relations
Educational Services Center
4700 South Yosemite Street
Greenwood Village, CO 80111**

**dstrohfus@cherrycreekschools.org
720-554-4244**





August 24, 2015

Molly Orkild-Larson
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 S. Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

RE: Cherry Tree Estates
Z15-001
TCHD Case No. 3594

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larson:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Preliminary Development Plan for a residential community, located northeast of the intersection of South Quebec Street and Cherry Creek Drive South. Tri-County Health Department (TCHD) has reviewed the application for compliance with applicable environmental and public health regulations and has the following comments.

Former Landfill

The subject property is located on a former landfill, designated as AR-044 in our records. The Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division (HMWMD) of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) conducted a Targeted Brownfields Assessment (Assessment) of the site and issued a report in September of 2005. The Assessment identified soil contamination and methane in exceedance of the lower explosive limit in the subsurface soils.

Flammable gas from the landfill poses a health and safety hazard to the development. Site grading and construction of buildings and utilities will disturb the landfill and will require proper management of waste in the landfill and restoration of the landfill cap. In addition, the waste and associated contamination of soils pose health and safety hazards to construction workers, as well as future tenants and visitors to the site.

The applicant will need to work with the CDPHE HMWMD to develop a Materials Management Plan and other related plans, e.g. Asbestos Management, and Health and Safety plans, and to incorporate flammable gas control systems into the project. The applicant shall contact Curtis Stovall, with CDPHE at: 303-692-2295 or curtis.stovall@state.co.us regarding the plans. Upon completion of those plans, they will require review by TCHD and CDPHE and approval by CDPHE

Cherry Tree Estates
Z15-001
TCHD Case #3594
August 24, 2014
Page 2 of 2

Please feel free to contact me at (720) 200-1568 or email at wbrown@tchd.org if you have any questions on TCHD's comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Warren S. Brown". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

Warren S. Brown, P.E.
Public Health Engineer

CC: Sheila Lynch, Lisa Oliveto, Laura DeGolier, TCHD
Curtis Stovall, P.E., CDPHE



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

Public Works and Development

6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, Colorado 80112-3853
Phone: 720-874-6500
Fax: 720-874-6611
TDD: 720-874-6574
www.arapahoegov.com
publicworks@arapahoegov.com

DAVID M. SCHMIT, P.E.
Director

Phone Conversation

Phone Conversation: Between Fonda Apostolopoulos – Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) and Molly Orkild-Larson, Arapahoe County – Planning Division

Date: January 27, 2016

Case No.: Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates – Preliminary Development Plan

Topic of Discussion

Status of the Clean-up of the Subject Property:

The subject property was used as a land fill for organic debris. CDPHE has wells on-site that are monitoring the methane being produced from the decomposition of this organic material.

Last year, the applicant contacted CDPHE to discuss the clean-up of the solid waste on the parcel and funding (Revolving Loan Fund) that is available for such a task. As part of CDPHE's Volunteer Clean-up Program, the applicant would need to put submit a Materials Management Plan which would address the removal of the debris on-site. CDPHE has reviewed with the applicant's consultant the requirements for this plan but as of yet, no plan has been submitted. Once received, there is a 45 day review period. If approved, the applicant has one year to start the removal process and two years to complete it. Once all the waste has been removed no methane will be present on the parcel and development can occur.

MISSION

Enhancing your quality of life through exceptional delivery of services and efficient use of public funds.

4* SQUARE MILE NEIGHBORHOODS

**But we are only 2.6 square miles!*

updated

February 3, 2016

Via Email

Ms Molly Orkild-Larson
Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Planning

Re: Cherry Tree Estates PDP Application, Z15-001

Dear Molly:

Four Square Mile Neighborhoods (4SQM) provides the following comments with respect to this proposed 2 parcel development for senior residents (55 years and older) who need assistance in one or more of their daily life activities. Plan Area #1 is 4.8 acres and will have a maximum of ten homes that will allow assisted living residences and single family attached townhome style residences. Plan Area #2 is 5.8 acres and will have a maximum of 43 homes which could be a style like assisted living residences, single family home, duplexes and townhomes.

Four Square Mile Neighborhoods appreciates the time the developer and his team took to work on the best possible development that they are requesting. We have had many meetings, small and large, with the team to hear the concerns of the neighbors. This parcel is an island located in 4SQM with two City of Denver PUD's, Concha and Granville West Homeowners Associations, adjacent to the proposed development. We arranged for some of the meetings with the HOA's and the developer and even suggested they float balloons to show the height and set back from the City of Denver properties.

We are aware that our position might not be the same as those residents in the City and County of Denver that are neighbors to this proposed development.

Responding for the residents in the 4SQM area, we are in support of this project with the concern that Plan Area #2 would have structures taller than our maximum of 35 feet. As proposed, Plan Area #1 maximum would be 32 feet, and this meets our maximum height of no more than 35 feet. As proposed, Plan Area #2 maximum would be 42 feet, which exceeds our height of 35 feet.

At a recent Planning Board Hearing, the applicant who wanted to build a senior assisted living center with a maximum building height of over 35 feet, was told that the project was approved but for no higher than 38 feet. We would take this as support from the Planning Board that the maximum building heights that 4SQM has set at 35 feet, should be the maximum height of any development in the 4SQM area. We could accept the maximum being the 38' on the parcel close to the river.

Ms Molly Orkild-Larson
Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Planning
February 3, 2016
Page 2

We may have additional comments as the plans become more definite and review the proposed FDP—particularly the more detailed appearance and design of the buildings.

Very Truly Yours,

FOUR SQUARE MILE NEIGHBORHOODS

By Mark Lampert

cc: Jan Yeckes, Arapahoe County

Molly Orkild-Larson

Subject: FW: Cherry Tree Estates, Case # Z15-001

From: George, Donna L [<mailto:Donna.L.George@xcelenergy.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2015 6:36 AM

To: Molly Orkild-Larson

Subject: RE: Cherry Tree Estates, Case # Z15-001

Hi Molly, here's a statement from Mike which may help:

"We do not have any conflict at this time. When plans get finalized and specific improvement locations are more defined, we will ask that an encroachment application be submitted, reviewed and approved and license agreements be issued for improvements within our electric transmission right-of-way."

Regards,

Donna



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: 303.571.3306
Facsimile: 303.571.3524
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

August 26, 2015

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Attn: Molly Orkild-Larson

Re: * AMENDED RESPONSE *
Cherry Tree Estates, Case # Z15-001

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Department has reviewed the plans for **Cherry Tree Estates** and requests the property owner/developer/contractor continue working with **Mike Diehl (Siting and Land Rights Supervisor at 303-571-7260)** regarding all electric transmission line and easement issues.

Please be aware PSCo also has existing natural gas and electric distribution facilities within the proposed project area. The property owner/developer/contractor must contact the **Builder's Call Line at 1-800-628-2121** and complete the application process for any new gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the **Utility Notification Center, at 1-800-922-1987** to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

Should you have any questions with this referral response, please contact me at 303-571-3306.

Donna George
Contract Right of Way Referral Processor
Public Service Company of Colorado



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: 303.571.3306
Facsimile: 303. 571.3524
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

August 20, 2015

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Attn: Molly Orkild-Larson

Re: Cherry Tree Estates, Case # Z15-001

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Department has determined **there is a conflict** with the above captioned project. Public Service Company has an existing electric transmission line and associated land rights as shown within this property. Any activity including grading, proposed landscaping, erosion control or similar activities involving our existing right-of-way will require Public Service Company approval. Encroachments across Public Service Company's easements must be reviewed for safety standards, operational and maintenance clearances, liability issues, and acknowledged with a Public Service Company License Agreement to be executed with the property owner. **PSCo is requesting that, prior to any final approval of the development plan, it is the responsibility of the property owner/developer/contractor to contact Mike Diehl Siting and Land Rights Supervisor at (303) 571-7260 to have this project assigned to a Land Rights Agent for development plan review and execution of a License Agreement.**

The developer must contact the **Builder's Call Line at 1-800-628-2121** and complete the application process for any new gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the **Utility Notification Center, at 1-800-922-1987** to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

Should you have any questions with this referral response, please contact me at 303-571-3306.

Donna George
Contract Right of Way Referral Processor
Public Service Company of Colorado

CHERRY CREEK VALLEY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT
2325 SOUTH WABASH STREET
DENVER, COLORADO 80231
(303) 755-4474

PAUL J. HANLEY, Chairman
JORGE-AYN G. RILEY, Vice-Chairman
PAUL R. THAYER, Secretary-Treasurer
LOUIS D. HALSELL, JR., Director
MARK L. LAMPERT, Director

September 28, 2015

Arapahoe County
Darla Brooks
6924 S Lima St
Centennial, CO 80112

Re: Cherry Tree Estates

The above referenced property is within the service area of the District. Water and sewer service is available subject to extension of water and sewer lines, payment of all fees and the District's Rules and Regulations.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

CHERRY CREEK VALLEY WATER
AND SANITATION DISTRICT


John Warford
District Manager

December 6, 2015

Tim VanMeter / Melissa Kendrick

Re: Cherry Tree Estates
Case # Z15-001

Dear Mr. VanMeter and Ms. Kendrick

The Concha Homeowners Association wants to thank you for the demonstration of bulk plane heights and distance you performed on Saturday, November 14. A number of homeowners attended the demonstration and witnessed the balloons placed on poles, set in various locations along our south common property line, to help give our homeowners an understanding of the potential impact of structures permitted by the latest version of your PDP. We understand you had no requirement to perform this demonstration and appreciate your willingness to do so.

Following the demonstration the assembled homeowners discussed their impressions. The reactions were unanimous that structures as close as 20 feet and as high as 32 feet was shocking and overwhelmingly negative. Shadows cast from the balloons shaded deeply into the adjacent properties and all the homeowners expressed concern that their privacy could be taken away by second story windows looking directly into the yards and homes along the common property line.

While the assembled homeowners expressed their gratitude for your outreach to the community, which the HOA board concurs with, the overall response from our community is to reinforce our request for angled bulk planes above 10' of height at the 20' setback. We believe the restriction of such a bulk plane can be managed architecturally, and will not necessarily diminish your ability to design structures of the type and density described in letters of intent and discussions with the community. We note the design of Concha townhomes have been designed to minimize the views into adjacent properties by offset and staggered structures with windows oriented away from private spaces and units. We hope the design of the proposed units follows these design guidelines and respects the rights of the existing homeowners to privacy and solar access.

Sincerely,



Dean Foreman, RA

Chairman, Architectural Control Committee
Concha Homeowners Association

Cc: Molly Orkild-Larsen, Mark Lampert, Paul Kashmann, HOA Board of Directors, Homeowners of Concha

RECEIVED

AUG 25 2015

ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PLANNING DIVISION

24 August 2015

Arapahoe County Planning Department
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112
Attn: Molly Orkild-Larsen, Project Planner

Re: Z-15-001 Cherry Tree Estates – Preliminary Development Plan ("**Cherry Tree Estates**")

Dear Molly:

As the Chairman of the Architectural Control Committee for the Concha Homeowners Association and as a resident of the community that borders on the proposed development I am responding to the recently received modifications to the original Planned Unit Development for the proposed Cherry Tree Estates referenced above.

We are in receipt of:

1. Letter dated July 23, 2015 from Kendrick Consulting representing Mr. Tim VanMeter regarding the Cherry Tree Estates- Preliminary Development Plan Application.
2. Revised Cherry Tree Estates Planned Unit Development Plan (PDP), undated.
3. Traffic Impact Study for Cherry Tree Estates, dated July 2015, prepared by SM Rocha, LLC (15-05434)

These comments and questions are also directed to the persons, organizations and agencies copied on this letter. While I have been asked to represent the community and the HOA board, these comments do not necessarily represent the opinions of all the residents.

This is the second response from our community regarding this project. It follows our letter of April 22, 2015 which responded to the original published PDP (undated) received in April 2015. In that letter the community expressed concern over a number of issues and made several requests, specifically:

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to indicate on the PUD that the height and density reflect the intent of the project as stated in its application letter of 1-30-15, namely "single story detached and attached residential homes". The community requested reduction in the 35'/45' height limits indicated and requested application of bulk planes along the common property border. (Note: Concha height limits are set to 28')
Response: No indication of single story structures nor modification to the height limits were made nor were bulk plane restrictions made part of the PDP
- **Request:** The applicant was requested to indicate on the PDP that the proposed density stated in the letters of intent match those on the language of the PDP (1.5 du/ac vs 2.25 for Planning Area 1, and 5.2 du/ac vs. 7.5 for Planning Area 2). This was based on plans originally provided indicating 7 buildings in Planning Area 1 and 30 duplex units for Planning Area 2. *The community expressed concerns that showing more density on the PDP than stated in letters of intent might lead to larger developments than proposed to date or that other developers could buy the rights to the development potential should this developer fail to construct his intended product (not uncommon)*
Response: The PDP proposed densities have not changed. All references to actual construction were removed from site plans. No building footprints, street layouts, parking areas are indicated on the revised PDP. Maximum Lot Coverage by Structures equal to 50% was added to the Development Criteria and a Dwelling Unit category was added delineating 10 dwelling units per acre in Planning Area 1 and 43 dwelling units in Planning Area 2.
- **Request:** The applicant was requested to perform a full traffic impact analysis correctly reflecting the full build-out of the property for both Planning Areas, to clarify the resident, visitor and employee parking for both Planning Areas, and to clearly indicate the internal road will be made a private gated road, as indicated in meetings with the community. It was further requested that the full traffic study anticipate the additional traffic generated by a non-gated road allowing through traffic from Colorado Avenue to

Quebec Street, and provide mitigation methods to relieve potential impacts at the Iowa/Quebec intersection. *The residents are concerned that the stated desire on the part of the applicant to create a gated private road, if not implemented, would lead to worsening traffic in the community and greater difficulty maneuvering the Iowa/Quebec intersection already experiencing peak traffic difficulties. The residents are also concerned that Quebec street improvements currently being envisioned by the City of Denver north of the project area are likely to exacerbate the poor LOS at the Quebec/Iowa intersection.*

Response: A full traffic impact analysis was provided, however the analysis does not correctly identify the full buildout potential of either Planning Area; contradicts the Planning Area 1 employee space provision in the PUD Off Street Parking Requirements table of 2 employee spaces per building (which is also contradicted by the applicants' 7/23/15 letter indicating 4 employee spaces per building); fails to consider traffic created by guests visiting the memory care facilities; appears to count 44 cars as the traffic impact of a full buildout in Planning Area 2 where the originally submitted PDP indicated a parking ratio of 2.25 spaces/unit; fails to take into consideration that 20% of the potential residents can be under 55 or temporary residents with potentially higher driving tendencies, and fails to anticipate through traffic if the road is not made a private gated roadway (no provision is made in the PDP for gating the road). In fact, all references to roadways and curb cuts, including the already permitted Denver curb cuts, have been removed from the documents. In addition, since the project has been granted right-in-right-out only access onto Quebec, any employee, visitor, service or emergency vehicle or resident desiring to turn south on Quebec street – to access south Denver and the Tech Center, Cherry Creek Drive, Evans and I-25- - would be forced into the neighborhoods or would make a U-turn at Iowa, negatively impacting an intersection which has already been given an F Level of Service (LOS). We do not believe the traffic impact analysis therefore properly represents the impact of the development. We note the applicant was granted curb cuts and road designs from the City of Denver without a land plan indicating its proposed use or full build-out potential. Normally curb cuts and roadway designs are determined from the actual uses anticipated.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to delineate how drainage between the subject Planning Area 1 buildings would be handled, and to delineate proposed sound and visual buffering from the Concha community. *The residents are concerned that the proposed project may not properly control drainage which has impacted residents along the north property line, and request landscape buffering from buildings with minimal internal separations.*

Response: The PDP removed all references to buildings, drainage and topography and offered no response to the community concerns. Note: the applicants assured residents in a meeting that all site drainage would be "handled", but no indication of that was offered in the documents. No landscape requirements are included in the PDP.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify on the PDP documents that the internal road be made private and gated as stated in multiple meetings with the community.

Response: No indication has been made on the PDP documents for a private gated road.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to reword the provision in the PDP Landscape Maintenance notes that "the adjacent property owners, Homeowners Associations or other entity besides Arapahoe County is responsible for maintenance and upkeep of perimeter fencing, landscaped areas, and sidewalks between the fence line and any paved roadways". It was requested that the applicant clearly indicate that adjacent neighboring property owners would NOT be responsible for upkeep of landscaped areas and sidewalks on the subject property. It was further requested that the applicant provide plans for perimeter fencing between the properties and to work with our community to determine the nature of the fencing and its maintenance.

Response: No changes were made to the Landscape Maintenance notes.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to make clear in the PDP Drainage Master Plan notes that the subject property alone would be responsible for design and construction of drainage connecting systems resulting from its development, and that the Concha development would NOT be responsible for any such connections as the Concha development has already established drainage systems and, because the surrounding developments are in a different jurisdiction, could not be compelled to participate in such

costs. *The residents are concerned that such notes might compel it to take part in mitigation of this development's impacts on drainage or maintenance of drainage facilities required for its construction.*

Response: No changes were made to the Drainage Master Plan notes.

- **Request:** The applicant was requested to confirm that it would comply with "Dark Skies" guidelines to ensure the projects' lighting would not exceed 0 footcandles at the common property line.
Response: No mention of lighting limitations or application of "dark skies" was included.
- **Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify the age restrictions for the development and to stipulate that Planning Area 1 should be limited to memory care homes/facilities, and that Planning Area 2 should stipulate age restrictions.
Response: The applicant modified the application from SH-PUD to MU-PUD and requested to forego Arapahoe County regulations for Senior Housing in favor of regulations under the Federal Housing for Older Persons Act (HOPA). Planning Area 1 development is limited to Assisted Living Residences, but Planning Area 2 uses have been expanded from housing for persons over 55, Memory Care Homes, and accessory uses to; Assisted Living residences, single family attached dwelling units, multi-family dwelling units, clubhouse, other appurtenant uses, home occupations and commercial radio facilities. *The community is concerned that the original stated intent of the project as "single story detached and attached residential homes" for the purpose of providing a "combination of housing types to support senior living with and without memory care challenges" has significantly expanded to include unrestricted multi family dwelling units (up to 20% is allowed by HOPA), commercial appurtenant uses and now commercial cell towers.* The addition of cell towers as an approved use is a concern as these facilities can be eyesores.
- **Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify conflicting Off Street Parking requirements.
Response: The July 23 letter of intent accompanying the proposal requests a variance from Arapahoe County off-street parking requirements for assisted living residences of 71 spaces for 7 buildings to 56 spaces for 7 buildings based on the "experience" of the developer. Yet the letter which indicates 4 employee spaces per building is contradicted by the PDP Off Street Parking Requirements for 2 employee spaces per building. The revised PDP also modified the Residential Housing off street parking requirements to indicate "per Land Development Code". A review of that code revealed that the code does not address parking requirements, thus leading to further confusion. The specific number of spaces for Residential Housing should be included in the PDP.
- **Request:** The applicant was requested to clarify the architectural character of the proposal in light of the value of the adjoining residences averaging approximately \$300,000, and to show that materials and design meet the quality and character of our development. *The residents are concerned that a poor quality of construction and materials will lessen the value of its homes.*
Response: All references to buildings, size, scale, form and materials have been removed from the PDP.
- **Request:** The applicant was requested to limit hours of construction from 7:30-5:30 M-F, to limit non-emergency service vehicle hours to the same hours and to provide a bio-waste hazard disposal plan.
Response: No response was provided.

In conclusion, the Concha Townhouse community is **very** concerned that **none** of the requests for modifications to the PDP have been adequately responded to by the revised PDP. The modification of the PDP from SH-PUD to MU-PDP has allowed the expansion of uses to include multi-family housing without age restrictions and now includes commercial uses; the lack of height modifications or bulk plane limitations continues to allow buildings of 3 and 4 stories in direct contradiction of the applicant's letters of intent and out of conformity with surrounding neighborhoods; requests to provide accurate traffic analysis and elimination of contradictions in parking requirements and provisions for a private gated road have not been addressed, so concerns of increased traffic problems have been ignored; requests for more information regarding what is actually proposed have been reversed with less information being provided; clarifications of drainage and maintenance issues have not been addressed; lighting restrictions have not been made part of the PDP; clarifications to the age restrictions have been

further loosened to include non-seniors; commercial cell tower uses and mixed-use structures have now been included, and no response to neighbors' concerns for construction time limits have been included.

While we continue to have faith that this developer has good intentions, we are more concerned now than prior to this revised PDP that this developer continues to expand the density and intent of the uses beyond his original proposal and letters of intent and continues to ignore the requests for modifications to the PDP. The addition of a PDP Development Criteria category of Dwelling Units now indicates 10 DU/acre in Planning Area 1 adding to our community's concerns that buildings up to 3 stories would be allowed there. Since all references to roads, parking, building footprints and architectural character have been deferred to the FDP, we are unable to understand what the developer is currently planning. We are therefore more concerned that the project might proceed to a final phase without any real indication of the proposed roadways, parking or buildings actually being planned.

We are also concerned that Arapahoe County has not considered the comments and concerns outlined in our letters, as evidenced by the revised PDP documents. We fear that our voice is lost due to the fact we are located in a different jurisdiction than the subject property—this despite the fact that the subject property is an island within our jurisdiction, and much of the impact of this development will be on the jurisdiction that surrounds it.

For these reasons, we do not support the Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan at this time. In spite of these concerns, the Concha Townhome community does desire to continue active discussions in the hope of making tangible modifications to the plans to respond to its stated concerns. We propose to meet with the developer and Arapahoe County Planning Department to address these issues, with the goal of enabling our community to support this development.

Sincerely,

Dean Foreman,
Architectural Control Committee Chair
Concha Townhouse Association

CC:

Lance Wheeland, President Concha HOA
Danielle Locquercio, Management & Maintenance
Paul Kashmann, Denver City Council Representative, District 6
Kathi Burdess, Property manager for Granville HOA

CONCHA TOWNHOUSE ASSOCIATION

c/o Management & Maintenance, Inc.

7803 East Havard Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80231
(303) 755-2732

RECEIVED

APR 24 2015

ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PLANNING DIVISION

22 April 2015

Arapahoe County Planning Department
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112
Attn: Molly Orkild-Larsen, Project Planner

Re: Z-15-001 Cherry Tree Estates – Preliminary Development Plan ("**Cherry Tree Estates**")

Dear Molly:

The Concha Homeowners Association represents 68 homes in a residential subdivision (Indian Creek Filing No. 3) located in the City and County of Denver, a portion of which lies adjacent to the Cherry Tree Estates on its northern boundary. Concha was developed over 30 years ago.

We take this opportunity to provide you with comments, questions and requests for clarification regarding the information you kindly provided:

1. Letter dated November 14, 2014 from Cherry Tree Estates, LLC to Arapahoe County Planning (Pre-Submittal Meeting request) (the "**11/14/14 Letter**").
2. Letter dated January 30, 2015 from Cherry Tree Estates, LLC to Arapahoe County Planning (Preliminary Development Plan Application) including the Major Technical Issues Summary (the "**1/30/15 Letter**")
3. Cherry Tree Estates Preliminary Development Plan (the "**PDP**")
4. Phase I Drainage Report for Cherry Tree Estates dated January 5, 2015 prepared by Roth Engineering Group (the "**Drainage Report**")
5. Site Traffic Generation and Traffic Impact Study Waiver Request dated January 22, 2015 prepared by SM Rocha, LLC (the "**Traffic Study Waiver Request**").

These comments and questions are also directed to the persons, organizations and agencies copied on this letter.

DENSITY:

- The 1/30/15 Letter states that "Cherry Tree Estates proposes single story detached and attached residential homes." The PDP indicates the Maximum Height of the Residential Buildings to be 35 feet in Phase 1 and 45 feet in Phase 2, and the Community Buildings 35 feet in both Phases and also states "Senior Homes in Phase 1 will be a lower scale than those In Phase 2 with corresponding variations in building heights". Such Maximum Heights could potentially allow 3- and 4-story buildings to be constructed, contrary to the applicant's stated intent and out of character with surrounding residential structures. Should the applicant decide to sell the property with the specified height allowances, a denser and higher potential build out is possible*. Bulk planes should be established along adjacent existing property and diagrammed as a condition of approval and the PDP's height limits revised. We propose a 10' height limit at the setback line then at 45 degrees away from the adjacent properties.

*Each building footprint in Phase 1 is ~5,000sf (conservatively). If all 7 buildings were built to the 35' height limit proposed each building could be 15,000 sf x 7 buildings = potentially 105,000 sf build out

- The PDP indicates the proposed density of Phase 1 at 2.25 DU per acre (with each Memory Care Home counting as one DU), and Phase 2 at 7.5 DU per acre. The Phase 1 plan of 7 buildings is less than 1.5 DU per acre and the preliminary plan for 30 duplex units on Phase 2 is approximately 5.2 DU per acre, based on the acreage indicated on the PDP. While the densities listed on the PDP may fall below the maximum contemplated by the County's subarea plan, they exceed the densities contemplated by the applicant. Along with the height allowances discussed the first bullet point above, this causes unnecessary confusion as to what the applicant intends to build and consternation regarding what the applicant or a future owner would be allowed to build and its real life impact on existing properties.

TRAFFIC

- The PDP shows Phase 2 as Future Expansion and the 1/30/15 Letter indicates that building footprints are provided only for Phase 1 because it is more defined. However, the Drainage Study is based upon the proposed uses for both phases as described in the 11/14/14 Letter and attached Site Plan Exhibits, which show 30 duplex units and one accessory building for Phase 2. In contrast, the Traffic Study Waiver Request is based upon an 84-unit assisted living facility with 28 employees.
 - Please clarify what is meant by an "84-unit assisted living facility". The 1/30/15 Letter states that each Senior Home can house up to 16 persons. There are currently 7 Senior Homes shown on Phase 1 of the PDP (112 persons).
 - Basing the waiver request on only Phase 1 of the property allows the property to meet one of the traffic study waiver requirements (less than 250 trips/day or 25 trips at peak), and only considers the 28 employees of the Memory Care facility and no guests (for which there are 4 parking spaces per building provided per the PDP) and no service vehicles for trash removal, food service, etc. However, the preliminarily proposed Phase 2, per the PDP's Off Street Parking Requirements for Housing for Persons, would provide 2 resident spaces per unit and .25 guest spaces per unit—an additional 68 potential vehicles, which would increase the average trip generation to exceed the waiver requirement.
 - In addition to a traffic study waiver based on volume, the Traffic Study Waiver Request affirms that it meets the waiver requirement that access is not being requested to either a State Highway or County arterial roadway. South Quebec Street is an arterial roadway—it is simply in a different county. The fact that the Subject Property is surrounded on all sides by a different jurisdiction provides the applicant this loophole while at the same time being wholly dependent upon this jurisdiction for access and viability. We request that the traffic study waiver request be denied and a traffic impact study required. Such study should include the following considerations:
 - The road running through the Subject Property is labeled on the PDP as a 30' private drive. The Street Maintenance note on the PDP makes it unclear as to whether the road is intended to remain private or be constructed to County standards such that is acceptable to be maintained by the County (i.e. not private). The applicant indicated in a meeting to our homeowners that such roadway would be private and gated. No gates are indicated on the PDP, and if the road is not required to be gated, traffic generated by users not living or working on the Subject Property should be estimated and taken into consideration.
 - The need for restrictions on U-turns and/or a traffic signal at the intersection of Iowa and South Quebec Streets.

PHASE 1 PLAN

- Please delineate how drainage is handled in the 20' setback between the north boundary of the Subject Property and the Concha property.
- Please delineate the proposed planting in property line setback areas to create sound and visual buffers
- Most of the building footprints show a distance of 10' from one another creating potential drainage issues. The Drainage Study notes that a small portion of the site along the north property line drains to the north and the soils on the north part of the site have a slow infiltration rate. Some of our homeowners have been impacted by flows simply from the applicant's grading of the site. Please address the drainage concerns in connection with the proximity of the Phase 1 buildings as shown on the PDP.

PDP DOCUMENT

- Street Maintenance. Please clarify if the road running through the Subject Property is intended to be private or built to public standard so as to be dedicated to Arapahoe County. If the intent is to gate the road and keep it private please revise this note to state that the roadway through the Subject Property, delineated as a 30' private drive, is required to be and remain private and be gated at both accesses.
- Landscape Maintenance. Reword the sentence stating: "The adjacent property owner(s), homeowner's association or other entity other than Arapahoe County is responsible for maintenance and upkeep of perimeter fencing, landscaped areas and sidewalks between the fence line/property line and any paved roadways." Adjacent property owners are **not** responsible for the maintenance or upkeep of the landscaped areas and sidewalks located on the Subject Property. As for perimeter fencing, we request that the applicant provide plans for the perimeter fencing along the north property line prior to finalizing this note regarding responsibility for maintenance and upkeep of such fencing. We request the applicant work with our community to develop a screening fence, or wall, of sufficient height and material to adequately screen the applicant property from the neighboring homes.
- Drainage Master Plan Notes. Note 2 indicates that the county will require the construction of a connection of the Subject Property's drainage system to a master planned outfall or drainage way and "encourages adjacent developments to join in designing and constructing connection systems". Since all adjacent developments are in a different jurisdiction, please make crystal clear that adjacent developments are not required to participate in the design and/or construction of any drainage connection systems.
- Lighting Requirements. While understanding that these are to be delineated in the FDP, we request that "dark skies" guidelines be imposed including 0 footcandles at adjacent property lines.
- The PDP's Age Restriction notes are confusing. Since the residents of Memory Care Facilities are not restricted by age, the PDP should clarify that the Age Restrictions apply to Phase 2 of the Subject Property and that Phase 1 of the Subject Property is restricted to Memory Care Homes/Facilities.
- The PDP uses the terms "Memory Care Facilities" and "Memory Care Homes" and "Senior Homes". Please either clarify that these terms mean the same building type as described in paragraph 3 of the Project Narrative, or preferably choose a single term to refer to such building type and a different term to refer to the proposed age-restricted residential housing units in Phase 2.

- The Off Street Parking Requirements indicate that 2 spaces per building are required for employees (14 spaces in Phase 1) while the Project Narrative indicates each home will have 4 staff members per shift. *Please clarify this discrepancy.*
- Architectural Character. The PDP states the community will be similar in character and scale to the surrounding single family and attached housing in the adjacent neighborhoods. The 1/30/15 Letter indicates that the applicant plans to meet with HOA groups to address concerns and impacts. We encourage such meeting to include the presentation of the applicant's most current architectural plans for both phases. The homes in Concha carry valuations in excess of \$300,000. Our owners must be assured that the architectural character and scale of Cherry Tree Estates is of a caliber that does not diminish adjacent property value.
- Trash collection. At the proper stage (PDP or FDP), the plan should illustrate the location of trash collection facilities.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Require construction hours to be limited to 7:30-5:30, Monday through Friday
- Require non-emergency service vehicle hours to be limited to 7:30-5:30, Monday through Friday
- Require applicant to provide bio-waste disposal plan

In conclusion, we would like to state that we appreciate the applicant's sensitivity to our shared property boundary demonstrated by the horseshoe shaped footprint of the memory care buildings with courtyards facing such boundary. We also support the overall proposed use of the property for senior dependent and over 55 independent living as needed in the community and respect the applicant's expertise in the field. We submit our questions and comments in an honest and forthright attempt to resolve concerns we may have in an expeditious and cooperative manner.

Please note, Dean Foreman, architect and Chairman of the Architectural Control Committee, and Danielle Loquercio, property manager, Management & Maintenance, Inc. have been asked to advise the board on these issues. Please copy them in all electronic correspondence.

Sincerely,



Lance Wheeland,
President, Concha Homeowners Association

Dean Foreman,
Chairman, Architectural Control Committee
dafclio@comcast.net

Danielle Loquercio
Property manager,
dlog@managementandmaintenance.net

Cc: Concha Homeowners
Melissa Kendrick, Kendrick Consulting Inc.
Charlie Brown, City Council Rep, District 6
Mark Lampert, Four Square Mile Neighborhood Association

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Timothy <vanmeter_t@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2016 11:14 AM
To: Roybal, Eugene R. - Parks & Rec
Cc: Melissa Kendrick; Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: Arapahoe triangle -Cherry Tree Estates

Dear Mr. Roybal:

As you know I am in the process of developing a senior housing living area on the 10 acres that I own. The property is in Arapahoe County as you may also know. The Arapahoe County planning staff recognizes that over the years pedestrians walked through the site to and from Quebec and E. Colorado Ave. Due to illegal dumping on my property I fenced the site in 2009. Now that we are about to begin driveway construction I have erected construction fence. I will be installing a security fence along the border of my property and Cherry Creek. I am being asked by the local neighborhoods to gate the Colorado Ave entrance to prevent cut through traffic. Thereby making a walking path through the middle of my property not feasible.

In the summer of 2014/2015 there were several crews from Denver working on the north bank of Cherry Creek. Dead trees and brush were cut and or removed. There were several times that I observed crews spraying herbicide to control noxious weeds. When I saw those individuals I made it a point to speak to them and thank them for cleaning up the north bank of Cherry Creek. There were a couple of individuals who stated that Denver Parks and Rec. had finally received approval to improve the north bank along that area. They stated that the north bank would be improved similar to the south bank.

Arapahoe County Open Space and their Parks Dept. doesn't have any communication from Denver about any impending/future plans for trail or bike path development. Can you shed any light on this subject ? Does Denver have a master plan for the area ? Is there anything planned in the near future ?

Would there be hiking or bike pathways along the north bank of Cherry Creek ? If there is a master plan where could I get a copy of such ?

Tim VanMeter

303-888-5459

vanmeter_t@msn.com

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: ddj6790@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2016 1:27 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Cc: dforeman@themulherngroup.com; lwheeland@mac.com; blederer41@gmail.com; dloq@managementandmaintenance.net; KLJ6790@AOL.Com
Subject: Case # Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Ms. Orkild-Larson:

As a homeowner living at 7512 East Iowa Ave. in the Concha Townhome Community, I would like to add my name to the list of residents voicing concerns about the above referenced subject: Case # Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates.

The first concern is traffic safety and the added dangerous congestion that will occur on Quebec St. and at the intersection of Quebec and Iowa when this project is completed. Quebec has become a heavily traveled and dangerous to access street in the last few years and although there has not been a recent traffic study of the area, anyone who travels this street knows the enormous and steadily increasing amount of traffic it carries. The owner of the proposed Cherry Tree Estates has obtained clearance to cross Denver land to exit the property onto Quebec, thus adding to the traffic and creating havoc at the intersection of Quebec and Iowa when drivers want to change direction and go south. (It has been conjectured that perhaps this clearance was given hastily and without regard for the safety of the exiting residents of Cherry Tree Estates or the surrounding neighborhoods.) It is also worth noting that when the original clearance was granted, the property owner was planning on far fewer residences and many fewer occupants who would be driving cars. Somewhere along the way and after clearance was granted, the plans changed to include many more people and many more residences.

The next concern revolves around the height and setbacks of the proposed buildings and the privacy, esthetics, and property values that will be adversely affected. Originally the project called for single-story group homes occupied by non-driving, senior and assisted-living residents. This concept appeared to be logical for the site and the location. The plans have since morphed into two-story and possibly three-story buildings sitting 20 feet beyond the backyard fences of the surrounding Concha neighbors and now available to a much broader demographic. After witnessing the balloon demonstration of the height and breadth of the project from an adjacent backyard, it became painfully evident that having a 32-foot-high building located 20 feet from your back fence would be a bit like having the Great Wall of China sitting in your back yard. It will be claustrophobic, it will create sun and shade issues, it will play havoc with privacy for both the Cherry Tree Estates' residents and Concha residents, and it cannot help but have a negative impact on the property values of the surrounding homes, which in turn, can affect the property values of the entire neighboring community, to include Arapahoe County residents.

It is, of course, understood that private property rights are to be respected and protected, however, when the rights and plans of one property owner clearly have a negative and damaging impact on the rights and property values of surrounding neighbors, it is clear that those plans need to be reevaluated.

For the reasons stated above, I respectfully request that the Arapahoe County Planning Board give very careful consideration and thought to the plans for Case #Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates. The health and safety and property values of many property owners in both counties are depending upon a wise decision.

Thank you for your consideration,

Diane D. Johnson

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: LKF1625@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 4:34 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Cc: Foreman, Dean
Subject: Cherry Tree Estates--Case #Z15-001

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larson:

This letter is to address the proposed Preliminary Development Plan for Cherry Tree Estates, Case #Z15-001.

I live in the Concha subdivision and my residence abuts Planning Area 1 as shown on the PDP. I have reviewed the PDP document as well as the applicant's notice. In addition, I have also reviewed the Memo to you from the applicant's consultant dated 11/6/15 on the PDP Criteria that was posted on Arapahoe County's website (the "Memo") as well as a Traffic Impact Study prepared for the applicant issued July 2015 prepared by SM Rocha, LLC.

I have many concerns about this proposed development, most particularly, its access and traffic impacts, and density.

1. **Density.** The PDP document uses the terms "assisted living residences" and "single family attached dwelling unit" "single family detached dwelling unit" and "multifamily dwelling unit" for proposed principal uses. There is an asterisk stating that "an assisted living dwelling unit includes a single structure with up to 16 assisted living patient beds." The term "assisted living dwelling unit" is self-defined and does not comport to the definitions of "assisted living residence" or "dwelling unit" as such terms are defined in Arapahoe County's Land Development Code. There is no concept of a single dwelling unit housing 16 persons. The closest definition in the Code to a "dwelling unit" housing multiple non-family members is a "Group Home" which is limited to 4-8 persons. Please address how a single structure housing 16 persons can be considered a single dwelling unit per the Code.

2. **Access.** The only access to the property from a major arterial is South Quebec Street, and from there, the property can only be entered from the south and exited to the north. Stated in the Memo, there are "numerous industrial and commercial establishments that provide services and jobs" along Quebec Street traveling south. Access to these services would be through existing neighborhoods from the 2nd, residential access on the property's southeast corner, over residential streets whose maintenance is paid for by Denver residents. Assisted living complexes require service and sometimes emergency vehicles—those coming from the north will also drive through the surrounding neighborhoods because of the right-in, right-out access limitations. Please address the concern that the access is not suitable for the proposed uses and density, and places a substantial burden on the surrounding neighborhoods.

3. **Traffic.** The applicant commissioned a traffic impact study and shared it with our HOA, which was appreciated. Unfortunately, the study falls short on the impact the proposed development will have on the streets surrounding it. It addresses traffic generated only by residents of the maximum 43 units proposed for Planning Area 2 and staff for assisted living residents—it does not consider trips by guests or the many service vehicles an assisted living facility requires. It considers the impact

on 4 intersections, with no mention of the impact of vehicles cutting through the neighborhoods because of the property's access limitations addressed above. The property's shortest route to head south on Quebec is through the neighborhood streets down Iowa Avenue, which already has an F level of service. Interestingly, the Memo states that no traffic impact study was required by the County. In such case, please address why the County has not coordinated with the municipality whose residents' taxes pay to maintain the roads this property is entirely dependent upon, and whose residents will be the ones most burdened with additional traffic through their neighborhoods and at already poorly serviced intersections. I assume if this property were entirely surrounded by Arapahoe County streets, its traffic impact would be an important matter for your consideration. Again, it is appreciated that the applicant went beyond the County's requirements to commission and share his study, but with all due respect, the fact that the property taxes generated by the proposed development will not be shared to maintain the roads it needs for its existence should prompt you to cooperate with Denver and require that the applicant address the full impact of the proposed development and any mitigation measures that could be taken.

4. Utilities. The Memo states that the proposal includes a will serve letter from Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District. It is my understanding that as of today, the applicant has not secured sanitary sewer service and is exploring various potential alternatives. Please address how this PDP can be approved without having secured all necessary utility service agreements.

5. Schools. The memo states that as a senior housing project, the school district was not referred to for comment. 80% of the proposed units are to be occupied by at least one person who is 55 or older. The PDP provides the applicant the ability not to build assisted living units—Planning Area 1 could be 20 duplexes. One 55 year old occupant per unit does not rule out children and/or grandchildren attending school. 20% of the units can be occupied by any age persons. The concern here goes back to traffic—I believe it's shortsighted to assume there will be no school age children nor buses and increased trips through our neighborhoods to get to and from school.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,
Lisa Foreman
1625 South Syracuse St.

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Robert Lederer <blederer41@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 2:05 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Cc: Kashmann, Paul J. - City Council; Dean and Lisa Foreman; Dean and Lisa Foreman; Molly Tracy; Danielle Loquercio; ddj6790@aol.com; Lance Wheeland; Pat Bird; Jim Craig; Sally and Gene Johnson; Paul Keebler; Ivo Roospold
Subject: Case #: Z15-001, Cherry Tree Estates

Dear Ms Orkild-Larson,

I am writing to you about the above mentioned case. I am a homeowner in the Concha Townhomes development. My address is 1617 S. Rosemary St. My home does not abut the subject property but it is about 300 feet from the property line. There are many concerns I have had about the subject development over the years that I have lived here. I was the President of the HOA at the time that the developer purchased the property and attempted, unsuccessfully to discuss his plans then.

I will limit my comments to one issue-**traffic**, though there are many concerns we all have.

This developer was granted a permit to have access to South Quebec Street just north of the bridge over Cherry Creek. My understanding is that he was able to convince someone at a mid-level in the Denver Streets Rights of Way to allow this access without a traffic study. Please note that to do this they also had to give up part of a dedicated park, City of Chennai Park. The land was Open Space and gave us access to the creek. At the time that the developer approached the many Denver departments he was stating that this would be a senior assisted living situation in single story group homes. He convinced everyone, including our homeowners that there would be minimal traffic in a Right In/Right Out situation at the curb cut. He stated that the residents would not have vehicles and the only traffic would be employees and service vehicles. He also stated that the entrance off Colorado Avenue, a residential street would be gated for emergency use only.

Now we find that he has taken out the senior living designation and has asked for a PUD which would allow 3 and 4 story dwellings on the property with much more density. The implication is that we can expect far more traffic if he or another developer were to build multifamily units on the subject property. This would result in more traffic going in and out on South Quebec Street. He has also removed any mention of a gate at Colorado Avenue so we can expect the potential for more "cut through" traffic from adjacent neighborhoods to the East.

My concern is the impact on the intersection of South Quebec Street and Iowa Avenue. If any one of you has been here during the hours of 7:30AM to 9AM and 4:30PM to 6PM you could observe the impossible and dangerous traffic situation that occurs now as people attempt to turn and go south on Quebec. If this development is allowed with no traffic mitigation, we can envision that the users of that property will wish to go south on Quebec at least half the time. That would force them to make a U-Turn at Iowa where there is no provision for such turns. All of us residents have observed traffic accidents and near misses at this intersection already. I know that you might respond by saying that this is a "Denver Traffic Issue" but I feel that whoever in Denver made this decision to grant access to an Arapahoe County Developer did not have all the information. A traffic study would have helped and if the developer would have been more honest about his intentions for the potential use of the property, it might not have been granted so freely.

It has been my observation that this developer and his hired staff will say whatever is needed to get his zoning changed without regard to residents concerns. I understand that we Denver residents have little to say about a

development that will impact us greatly but benefits Arapahoe County only. I see no benefits accruing to Denver from allowing this long vacant, landlocked former dump site to be developed as it is proposed (high density). At one time Arapahoe County Open Space offered to purchase the land but he was unwilling to sell at the offered price for agricultural land.

Robert L. Lederer
1617 S. Rosemary St.
Denver, CO 80231

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Mary Ann Mayo <maryann.mayo@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 12:14 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: Cherry Tree Estates PDP. Case Z15-001

Dear Molly,

When I purchased my home eight years ago, my realtor told me that although the land behind me was privately owned, the likelihood of it being developed was minimal. Reasons being: accessibility, designated flood plain, landfill. Obviously, in a different economy those reasons are negated.

When the development was initially proposed to the Concha HOA by Mr. Van Metre, we were told it would be approximately 8-10 single story cottages housing 8-12 residents with memory or other skilled care issues. He explained in detail how innovative and sensible this residential model was for people in need of skilled care. Although I was not in favor of the development and would sorely miss watching the prairie dogs, Hawks, coyotes interact, I felt that it would be a non-invasive, quiet community with least amount of impact on the already congested traffic situation on Quebec and Iowa. The current proposal seems to be hugely changed from the initial proposal of a maximum of ten cottages serving people unable to manage their daily needs to 53 residences of various height and design as well as a club house and administrative offices serving a senior population. I realize that the owner gets far more bang for his buck by cramming as many buildings and possible in the space available which may be the reason for this drastic change from the original proposal.

I have several concerns about the current proposal:

Drainage--there is currently a marked slope from the Cherry Tree property into my backyard. How will drainage be addressed to prevent run off pouring into my yard?

Traffic--the notice says that this is designed to be a low density, low impact residential community that provides for persons 55 and older. With each of these residents housing a minimum of one driver, I fail to see how this would be low impact. How will a person driving south on Quebec access the community? or exiting the community go south on Quebec?

Aesthetics--having multi-story homes crammed together 20 feet from our fences is unsettling and upsetting....light, privacy and noise are very much a concern. I trust that all buildings are in compliance with Arapahoe County building codes, but it is disturbing that these structures will so significantly change my landscape and privacy, especially since the units will be housing eight to twelve residents. A single story unit is much more palatable.

I am sadden to know that I will not longer have my beautiful winter sunset views and enjoy the quiet, peaceful open space that I have enjoyed.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mayo
1668 South Rosemary St
Denver, Co 80231

Sent from my iPad

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Lance Wheeland <lwheeland@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2016 8:19 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Cc: Paul Keebler; Pat Bird; Lance Wheeland; Sally and Gene Johnson; Danielle Loquercio; jimcraig@comcast.net; Dean and Lisa Forman; paul.kashmann@denvergov.org
Subject: Cherry Creek Estates Development south of the City of Chennai Park Z15-001 PDP

Dear Planning Commission Members

I am the President of the Concha Townhomes HOA Board of Directors. I am writing to provide you with some information regarding the proposed development directly adjacent to our townhomes. We have met with the developer, Mr. Van Meter, and his agent Ms. Kendrick on several occasions. We sincerely appreciate their willingness to meet with us regarding the proposed development. It is our intention to meet with our Board and homeowners prior to the hearing on February 16th to try and make a decision as to our position on this preliminary development plan.

When we first met with Mr. Van Meter it was our understanding that he would be building six or seven one story memory care assisted living facilities housing about 16 residents each. We wanted to know what that might look like so Mr. VanMeter graciously invited anyone who could to visit his other facilities in Arvada, which we did. At that time, Mr. VanMeter indicated that he would be building similar buildings. Initially, the response to his proposal was neutral to positive.

Then we saw the first proposal for what he hoped to build. It included 10 assisted living facilities for sixteen people and 41 additional single family attached units. The assisted living facilities could be up to 32 feet high permitting multiple stories, and the single family attached dwellings would be up to 42 feet high. And given that the PDP does not require any design plans, our homeowners and our Board became somewhat alarmed. We have shared our concerns through our Architectural Control Committee Chairman, Dean Foreman, a commercial architect, with both the developer and the staff of the Arapahoe County Planning Department, the Denver Planning Department and our Denver City Councilman, Councilman Paul Kashman. Suffice it to say we are now very concerned about building heights, setbacks from other homeowners property, parking for residents and staff, traffic congestion onto South Quebec and the proposed use allowing for up to 20% of the units to be purchased by people who are not seniors. We are also concerned that we won't know what the footprint for this development will be until we see the Final Development Plan. I urge you to carefully review Mr. Foreman's detailed letter of our concerns which is included in your packet.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Lance Wheeland, President
Concha Townhomes Association
1673 S. Trenton Street
Denver, CO 80231
720-440-1818

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Lisa Sewald <Lisa.Sewald@pulte.com>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 3:26 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: No more housing - Cherry Tree Estates

Molly,

This is to inform you that I am an Indian Creek home owner who does not approve of more housing being built in this area. The neighborhood is already overpopulated. Traffic on Quebec is already heavy. The land should be developed into a public park or left as a natural easement to the creek.

Thank you,
Lisa Sewald
1577 South Syracuse St

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and delete the message and any file attachments from your computer. Thank you.

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Dr. Rick Worley <rfwracer@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 2:15 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Cc: dloq@managementandmaintenance.net; 'Sharon Calahan'
Subject: Cherry Creek Estates Development south of the City of Chennai Park Z15-001 PDP

Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development

Arapahoe County Lima Plaza, 6924 South Lima Street, Centennial CO 80112

720-874-6650 Planning / 720-874-6574 TDD / 720-874-6611 Fax

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larson:

We live in Indian Creek immediately north across E. Iowa Ave. from the Concha townhome development which is immediately adjacent to the proposed Cherry Creek Estates property on its' north border. I am a dentist who treats seniors living in senior communities including independent & assisted living, skilled nursing & memory care from a mobile dental clinic that is a dental treatment operatory in a small motor home. I have intimate & immediately current knowledge of how these communities are staffed, the traffic involved with these communities, how dense the resident load must be for these communities to be economically viable and, most critically, how every, not most, but every community we visit with our mobile clinic, which is in excess of sixty in the metro Denver area, has an acute shortage of parking for those residents who still drive, caregivers, staff & the multitude of portable mobile ancillary health care entities that, daily & essentially constantly, must visit these communities. Profitability demands that these community developers maximize structure so as to house as many residents as possible on a given piece of real estate at the expense of vehicle traffic & parking considerations. To say the vehicle traffic associated with senior communities, particularly those that offer assisted living & skilled nursing, is constant & nearly overwhelming is an understatement. This is not a personal opinion: it is consistent fact observed daily by a professional working in the senior care environment.

The prospectus provided by Cherry Creek Estates has notably changed from the initial submission & in its' present form provides absolutely no indication of the proposed resident density or proposed on property parking accommodations which have a direct correlation to anticipated traffic density. Given that these absolutely critical pieces of information are surprisingly omitted, permit me, based on my extensive experience in & with senior care communities, to make these conservative estimates:

Area 1: 10 homes of 2 stories each. Assume 4 residents /storey. $4 \times 2 \times 10 = 80$ residents.

Area 2: 43 homes of 3 stories each. Assume 4 residents/storey. $4 \times 3 \times 43 = 1032$ residents. This is a total of 1112 residents

Assume perhaps half of the 43 homes in Area 2 are duplex style independent living facilities w/ 4 residents per duplex. $21 \text{ structures} \times 4 \text{ residents/structure} = 84$

$22 \text{ structures} \times 12 \text{ residents /structure} = 264$ This is a total of 348 residents.

This rather simple assumption reveals that as many as 458 to 1112 residents could be living in this proposed development. I acknowledge each residential unit may not be occupied by two individuals. Never the less, the number of residents in the proposed development will indeed be substantial. It HAS to be for the business to be profitable.

Excepting independent living, staff is usually around 1 staff per 20 residents, often more to include administrative staff. $348/20 = 17$ staff. $1112/20 = 55$ staff. There could, therefore, be as many as 17 to 55 individuals, most of whom will drive a vehicle to work, associated with this community. Multiple resident transportation vans & automobiles enter & exit these communities. These vehicles are often of considerable size to accommodate handicap lifts &

multiple residents being transported & these vehicles remain in & around senior communities constantly. Additionally, multiple other support vehicles enter & exit these communities daily & frequently, such as food delivery trucks, mobile radiology services, oxygen service trucks, vehicles associated with caregivers, physical & occupational therapists and, yes indeed, our mobile dental clinic. It is absolutely assured the traffic of emergency vehicles, usually large paramedic ambulances & fire trucks, will be a nearly daily event. Again, this is not personal opinion, these numbers & estimates are not pulled out of thin air; I personally observe this every day we are in the field providing dentistry to our senior community.

There is NO WAY the communities of Indian Creek, Landmark, Concha, Arrowhead & other adjacent high density residential developments can withstand this volume of traffic with the ingress & egress for the proposed Cherry Creek Estates being ONLY from NB Quebec or S. Colorado Ave. from Trenton St., which is deep within the Concha & Arrowhead residential developments. Concha & adjacent communities provide limited & difficult on street parking for large numbers of vehicles. It is impossible to enter or exit the proposed development from or onto SB S. Quebec. S. Quebec between Iliff & S. Parker Rd. already carries a heavy volume & is rated one of the most congested streets in Denver. The ingress & egress to our communities involving S. Quebec & Florida Ave. & particularly E. Iowa Ave. is already difficult & often hazardous at nearly all times except the dead of night. It can, therefore, be surmised the traffic thru the Indian Creek & Concha developments involving E. Iowa Ave. & S. Colorado Ave. associated with the proposed Cherry Creek Estates project will be excessive, much more than these streets were intended to carry. It is impossible for any "traffic calming measures" to accommodate this anticipated volume of traffic. Volume is the issue, not vehicle speed; speed bumps, meandering streets & traffic circles will only contain the large volume of traffic within the proposed project and our adjacent communities for a longer period of time.

The streets involved fall within the jurisdiction of the C&C of Denver. Arapahoe County planning & zoning must interact & cooperate with Denver in the process of evaluating the traffic impact of this proposed development. It is critical that this interagency/intergovernmental cooperation be done with the best interests of current Denver residents in mind, not just residents of your county. Confusion regarding reasonable consideration & cooperation between both county governments that results in a development that will have a disastrous impact on local Denver County traffic "flying under the wire" is to be avoided. The traffic studies I have reviewed regarding this project do not accurately reflect the daily reality experienced in our neighborhood & do not accurately estimate the traffic impact this proposed project will have. This project has a very real potential to negatively & significantly impact adjacent neighborhood traffic & pedestrian safety & quality of life.

The zoning proposition that communities must, by government regulation, allow facilities for the elderly, disabled & other disadvantaged citizens to be embedded within the larger community can often be valid BUT such action must not so negatively impact the surrounding community that it presents an undue hardship or burden. As a senior myself, please know I serve the senior community in my semi-retirement as much or more as a mission than a profitable business. I have no animosity towards or concerns about seniors living within in our larger community. However, I also know from daily experience just how intense & congested the traffic associated with senior care communities is. The proposed Cherry Creek Estates project will present just such an unreasonable & undue burden on our adjacent residential communities given the unique traffic flow issue associated with this property that has no resolution. I ask that your office carefully consider this issue & deny the zoning change request for Cherry Creek Estates.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard F. Worley, D.D.S.
7821 E. Iowa Ave. Denver, CO 80231

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: LAUREL DEHAMER <laurel7939@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2016 7:13 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: Cherry Tree Estates

Good Evening,

I wanted to send a note regarding the Cherry Tree Estates Planning. I will be trying to attend. However, I also wanted to send my thoughts to you in case I can't be there. Overall, I like what I see, but I have a couple of concerns.

1) I live right on the cul-de-sac of Colorado Ave. When the development started, I have noticed changes. I live on a quiet residential street. The developer has stated in the plans that the Colorado Ave access point will be the secondary access point. They also state that they will do all they can in the new development to limit vehicles from using the area to commute. I appreciate this. However, I have noticed that the individuals involved in the project prefer to use Colorado Ave. over Quebec St. for their own access. Whenever they arrive to do any maintained/clean up, ext, they seem to prefer to use the Colorado Ave. access point. Therefore, trucks, trailers, ext. are using this street. It is a quiet residential street. However, if this continues to be the access point during construction it will be a great change to the quality of life on our quiet street. Also, we will begin seeing nails, tire damage, ext. if this becomes an access point for construction vehicles. I would like to ask the developer to commit to using the Quebec St. as a requirement for their construction vehicles and crews as that is less of residential street. I also worry that Colorado Ave will be a preferred access point for construction during the 2nd phase.

2) When the development started, a large construction fence was installed on our cul-de-sac. It is unsightly. I understand that they need to limit access to the site, but I don't understand the need for such a large fence. Also, the fence now extends well outside the boundaries of the property. The fence goes all the way from the property to the water of the Cherry Creek. I used to walk along this area to get to the Cherry Creek path. I walked outside of the property. My access is now cut off and I can no longer walk to the Cherry Creek path. There is no way for a vehicle to get into the area to dump, so I don't understand why this fence was necessary well outside the boundaries of the property. It appears they were purposely trying to stop pedestrian traffic along the property, and I don't understand this. I would like to ask the developer to limit the fence to their private property so the residents around the area can again get access to the Cherry Creek trail.

Thank You so much for your time. I really appreciate it. I will do all I can to attend the meeting. If I can not, will you please be my voice?

Regards,

Laurel DeHamer
303-669-3532



MEMORANDUM

TO: Dorothy Eisenbraun, PE

FROM: Joseph L. Henderson, PE, PTOE

DATE: July 24, 2007

RE: Conceptual Design of the Quebec Street Access to the Proposed Cherry Tree Estates Development
SEH No. ACHERT0701.00

SEH has developed a conceptual design for the Quebec Street access to the proposed Cherry Tree Estates development (see Figure 1). This access has been designed to be a full time two-way access that will accommodate the largest fire truck from the Cunningham Fire Protection District. The proposed access will be located north of the Quebec Street bridge entirely within the Cherry Creek right-of-way and does not encroach on the Chennai Park. In addition, the geometry of the access was designed to avoid the existing utility pole that exists north of the bridge.

The proposed access design is shown without acceleration or deceleration lanes due to the low volume of traffic that is expected to use this access. The main access to the development is proposed to be on East Colorado Avenue.

A review of the intersection sight distance for the Quebec Street access was performed to confirm that the intersection site distance required by AASHTO¹ will be present. A design speed of 40 mph was assumed in determining the required distance for a car that is entering Quebec Street from the site access to see an oncoming vehicle in enough time to safely enter the street. Figure 2 contains the sight triangle showing the position of the vehicles and the bridge rail that could block the site of the motorist. A review of Figure 2 shows that the site line does not cross the bridge rail at the north end of the bridge. Since the line of sight of the motorist does not cross the bridge rail, the motorist entering Quebec Street has a clear view of the oncoming vehicle at the minimum intersection sight distance required by AASHTO for 40 MPH.


I would be happy to discuss this matter at your request.

jlh

Attachments

p:\ae\c\chert\070100\project\word\memorandum.doc

¹ A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 5th Edition. American Association of Streets and Highways. 2004



CHERRY TREE ESTATES
 PRELIMINARY ACCESS DESIGN - 105' Aerial Platform - Cunningham Fire Protection District

Scale	1"=50'	Date	7/19/07	Drawn by	RAC	Job #	ACHERT0701	Figure	1
-------	--------	------	---------	----------	-----	-------	------------	--------	---

STANDARD NOTES:

THE OWNER(S), DEVELOPER(S) AND/OR SUBDIVIDER(S) OF THE PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN KNOWN AS CHERRY TREE ESTATES, THEIR RESPECTIVE SUCCESSORS, HEIRS AND/OR ASSIGNS AGREE TO THE FOLLOWING NOTES:

STREET MAINTENANCE:

IT IS MUTUALLY UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED THAT THE DEDICATED ROADWAYS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT/PLAN WILL NOT BE MAINTAINED BY THE COUNTY UNTIL AND UNLESS THE STREETS ARE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS IN EFFECT AT THE DATE CONSTRUCTION PLANS ARE APPROVED, AND PROVIDED CONSTRUCTION OF SAID ROADWAYS IS STARTED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THE CONSTRUCTION PLAN APPROVAL. THE OWNERS, DEVELOPERS AND/OR SUBDIVIDERS, THEIR SUCCESSORS AND/OR ASSIGNS IN INTEREST, SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR STREET MAINTENANCE UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE COUNTY ACCEPTS THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAINTENANCE AS STATED ABOVE.

DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE:

THE PROPERTY OWNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTENANCE OF ALL DRAINAGE FACILITIES INSTALLED PURSUANT TO THE SUBDIVISION AGREEMENT. REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO MAINTAINING THE SPECIFIED STORM WATER DETENTION/ RETENTION VOLUMES, MAINTAINING OUTLET STRUCTURES, FLOW RESTRICTION DEVICES AND FACILITIES NEEDED TO CONVEY FLOW TO SAID BASINS. ARAPAHOE COUNTY SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO ENTER PROPERTIES TO INSPECT SAID FACILITIES AT ANY TIME. IF THESE FACILITIES ARE NOT PROPERLY MAINTAINED, THE COUNTY MAY PROVIDE NECESSARY MAINTENANCE AND ASSESS THE MAINTENANCE COST TO THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY.

EMERGENCY ACCESS:

EMERGENCY ACCESS IS GRANTED HERewith OVER AND ACROSS ALL PAVED AREAS FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY VEHICLES.

LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE:

THE OWNERS OF THIS PLAN OR PLAT, THEIR SUCCESSORS AND/OR ASSIGNS IN INTEREST, THE ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER(S), HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION OR OTHER ENTITY OTHER THAN ARAPAHOE COUNTY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTENANCE AND UPKEEP OF PERIMETER FENCING, LANDSCAPED AREAS AND SIDEWALKS BETWEEN THE FENCE LINE/PROPERTY LINE AND ANY PAVED ROADWAYS. THE OWNERS OF THIS SUBDIVISION, THEIR SUCCESSORS AND/OR ASSIGNS IN INTEREST, OR SOME OTHER ENTITY OTHER THAN ARAPAHOE COUNTY, AGREE TO THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MAINTAINING ALL OTHER OPEN SPACE AREAS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT.

SIGHT TRIANGLE MAINTENANCE:

THE OWNERS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY CONTAINING A TRAFFIC SIGHT TRIANGLE ARE PROHIBITED FROM ERECTING OR GROWING ANY OBSTRUCTIONS OVER THREE FEET IN HEIGHT ABOVE THE ELEVATION OF THE LOWEST POINT ON THE CROWN OF THE ADJACENT ROADWAY WITHIN SAID TRIANGLE.

DRAINAGE MASTER PLAN:

THE POLICY OF THE COUNTY REQUIRES THAT ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN THE REQUIRED DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AS SET FORTH BELOW:

- DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT THE LOCAL DRAINAGE SYSTEM AS DEFINED BY THE PHASE III DRAINAGE REPORT AND PLAN.
- DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT THE CONNECTION OF THE SUBDIVISION DRAINAGE SYSTEM TO A DRAINAGEWAY OF ESTABLISHED CONVEYANCE CAPACITY SUCH AS A MASTER PLANNED OUTFALL STORM SEWER OR MASTER PLANNED MAJOR DRAINAGEWAY. THE COUNTY WILL REQUIRE THAT THE CONNECTION OF THE MINOR AND MAJOR SYSTEMS PROVIDE CAPACITY TO CONVEY ONLY THOSE FLOWS (INCLUDING OFFSITE FLOWS) LEAVING THE SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT SITE. TO MINIMIZE OVERALL CAPITAL COSTS, THE COUNTY ENCOURAGES ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS TO JOIN IN DESIGNING AND CONSTRUCTING CONNECTION SYSTEMS. ALSO, THE COUNTY MAY CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE WITH A DEVELOPER IN THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE CONNECTION SYSTEM.
- EQUITABLE PARTICIPATION IN THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE MAJOR DRAINAGEWAY SYSTEM THAT SERVES THE DEVELOPMENT AS DEFINED BY ADOPTED MASTER DRAINAGEWAY PLANS (SECTION 3.4 OF THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT MANUAL) OR AS REQUIRED BY THE COUNTY AND DESIGNATED IN THE PHASE III DRAINAGE REPORT.

SPECIFIC NOTES:

AGE RESTRICTION:

80% OF THE UNITS MUST BE OCCUPIED BY AT LEAST ONE PERSON 55 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER. IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

LANDSCAPING:

A LANDSCAPING PLAN WILL BE PROVIDED WITH ANY FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THIS PROPOSAL AND BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.

LIGHT REQUIREMENTS:

A LIGHTING PLAN WILL BE PROVIDED WITH ANY FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY LIGHTING STANDARDS. LIGHTING FIXTURES WILL BE CHOSEN BASED UPON THEIR COMPATIBILITY WITH OVER-ALL ARCHITECTURE AND SITE DESIGN.

PRIVATE DRIVEWAY

THE ROADWAYS WITHIN THE CHERRY TREE ESTATES DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PRIVATE AND DESIGNED WITH TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES WHICH MAY INCLUDE BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO: CURVILINEAR ROADWAY DESIGN, ROUND-A-BOUNTS, SIGNAGE, SPEED HUMPS AND GATES AT EITHER OR BOTH ENTRANCES AND EXITS.

FENCING:

ALL PERMANENT FENCING, SCREENS AND RETAINING WALLS WILL BE WOOD, VINYL, ALUMINUM, WROUGHT IRON AND/OR MASONRY TO COMPLIMENT THE ARCHITECTURAL MATERIALS AND STYLE OF THE PERMANENT STRUCTURES.

SIGNAGE:

A SIGNAGE PLAN WILL BE PROVIDED WITH ANY FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY SIGNAGE STANDARDS.

FOUR SQUARE MILE AREA:

- TO INCLUDE SAID DEVELOPMENT WITHIN A SPECIAL DISTRICT FOR THE PURPOSE OF PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF NECESSARY OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS AT THE TIME OF APPROVAL OF FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS.
- TO COOPERATE WITH OTHER OWNERS OF OTHER PARCELS AND/OR SPECIAL DISTRICTS IN OFF-SITE ROADWAY AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS AS NECESSITATED BY DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.
- TO INCLUDE SAID DEVELOPMENT IN A MASTER DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT IF SUCH A DISTRICT IS FORMED.

CHERRY TREE ESTATES PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21,
TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO



VICINITY MAP

SCALE 1" = 2000'

IMAGE PROVIDED BY GOOGLE MAPS

PROJECT NARRATIVE:

CHERRY TREE ESTATES IS A RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY THAT PROVIDES HOUSING FOR PERSONS 55 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER INCLUDING THOSE NEEDING ASSISTANCE IN ONE OR MORE DAILY LIFE ACTIVITIES DUE TO HANDICAPS THAT LIMIT THEIR CAPACITIES TO CARE FOR THEMSELVES. THIS COMMUNITY IS INTENDED TO COMPLY WITH THE FAIR HOUSING ACT FOR OLDER PERSONS WHICH REQUIRES AT LEAST 80 PERCENT OF THE OCCUPIED UNITS TO BE OCCUPIED BY AT LEAST ONE PERSON WHO IS 55 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER. THE COMMUNITY WILL COMPLY WITH ALL REQUIRED RULES ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR VERIFICATION OF OCCUPANCY INCLUDING EXCEPTIONS TO THE AGE RESTRICTION AS DETAILED IN THE SPECIFIC NOTES.

THE PROPERTY IS AN INFILL SITE WITHIN UNINCORPORATED ARAPAHOE COUNTY LOCATED IN AN URBAN SETTING AND SURROUNDED BY ESTABLISHED RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS THAT ARE IN THE CITY OF DENVER. THE PROJECT IS DIVIDED IN TWO PLANNING AREAS SEPARATED BY A LARGE UTILITY EASEMENT. PLANNING AREA 1 IS 4.8 ACRES IN SIZE WITH A MAXIMUM DENSITY OF 2.10 DU/ACRE AND ALLOWS ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENCES AND SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENCES. PLANNING AREA 2 IS 5.8 ACRES IN SIZE WITH A MAXIMUM DENSITY OF 7.41 DU/ACRE ALLOWING FOR ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENCES AND RESIDENTIAL HOMES WITH A CLUB HOUSE DESIGNED FOR THE RESIDENTS AND STAFF OF THE DEVELOPMENT. THE CLUB HOUSE PROVIDES AMENITIES SUCH AS: OFFICE SPACE, KITCHEN FACILITIES AND A GATHERING SPACE FOR COMMUNITY MEMBERS. THE TOTAL MAXIMUM DENSITY OF THE SITE IS 4.98 DU/ACRE WITH A MAXIMUM OF 53 DWELLING UNITS.

THE PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO BE SENSITIVE TO THE NEIGHBORS BY DESIGNING A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLANNING AREA 1 WITH LOWER SCALE HOMES OF A SIMILAR HEIGHT AND LESS DENSITY THAN THE ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOODS. PLANNING AREA 2 IS FURTHER AWAY FROM THE ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOODS AND PROPOSES AN INCREASE IN MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT SIMILAR TO THE NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE EAST. THE OVERALL MAXIMUM DENSITY AND RESIDENTIAL LAND USE COMPLIES WITH THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

THE PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO HAVE A LOW IMPACT IN TERMS OF NOISE, TRAFFIC, BUILDING HEIGHTS AND DENSITY. HOUSING FOR SENIORS AND SENIORS NEEDING ASSISTANCE IS AN IMPORTANT SERVICE TO THE AREA AND THE IN FILL SITE ALLOWS RESIDENTS TO BE INTEGRATED INTO THE COMMUNITY.

THE PROPERTY HAS DIRECT ACCESS TO SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACES SUCH AS CHENNAI PARK AND THE CHERRY CREEK CORRIDOR. QUEBEC STREET IS A MAJOR ARTERIAL THAT PROVIDES CONVENIENT TRANSIT, VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS FOR THE COMMUNITY. THERE ARE SHOPPING AND SERVICES AVAILABLE IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE PROPERTY.

AS DEFINED BY THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, AN ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENCE IS A RESIDENTIAL FACILITY THAT MAKES AVAILABLE HOMES TO THREE (3) OR MORE PERSONS, NOT RELATED TO THE OWNER OF SUCH FACILITIES, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY THROUGH A RENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE RESIDENT INCLUDING ROOM AND BOARD AND AT LEAST THE FOLLOWING SERVICES: PERSONAL SERVICES; PROTECTIVE OVERSIGHT; SOCIAL CARE DUE TO IMPAIRED CAPACITY TO LIVE INDEPENDENTLY; AND REGULAR SUPERVISION THAT SHALL BE AVAILABLE ON A TWENTY-FOUR (24) HOUR BASIS, BUT NOT TO THE EXTENT THAT REGULAR TWENTY FOUR (24) HOUR MEDICAL OR NURSING CARE IS REQUIRED AS DEFINED UNDER CCR 1011-1.

ACCESS AND CIRCULATION:

THE PROPERTY ACCESS IS OFF OF S. QUEBEC STREET ON THE WESTERN BOUNDARY AND OFF OF COLORADO AVENUE ON THE EASTERN BOUNDARY. THE S. QUEBEC STREET ACCESS IS THE PRIMARY ACCESS TO THE PROJECT AND IS A RESTRICTED RIGHT IN, RIGHT OUT TURNING MOVEMENT. VEHICULAR CIRCULATION IS THROUGH A PRIVATE DRIVE THAT LOOPS THROUGH THE PROPERTY FROM THESE TWO ACCESS LOCATIONS.

ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY WILL BE SIMILAR IN CHARACTER TO THE SURROUNDING SINGLE FAMILY AND ATTACHED HOUSING IN THE ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOODS. HOMES WILL BE CONSTRUCTED WITH MATERIALS THAT MAY INCLUDE BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO: WOOD, BRICK, STONE AND METAL WITH TYPICAL ASPHALT OR SIMILAR ROOFING MATERIALS. BUILDINGS MASSING WILL BE TYPICAL OF RESIDENTIAL DESIGN ENSURING NO UNOBSTRUCTED WALL EXPANSIONS WITHOUT OPENINGS OR CHANGES IN ELEVATION OR PLANE. SPECIFIC MATERIALS AND ARCHITECTURAL TREATMENTS WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE FDP AS ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES AND AMENITIES ARE CONSIDERED FOR EACH LAND USE.

PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION AND OPEN SPACE

AN INTERNAL PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION SYSTEM WILL BE CREATED WITHIN THE COMMUNITY TO ALLOW FOR SAFE AND EASY CONNECTION FROM THE PROPOSED DWELLING UNITS, PARKING AREAS AND OFF-SITE PARKS AND TRAILS. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT WILL COORDINATE WITH THE CITY OF DENVER PARKS DEPARTMENT FOR CONNECTIONS WITH THE CHERRY CREEK TRAIL AND CORRIDOR. THE CITY OF DENVER CHENNAI PARK IS LOCATED AT THE NORTHWESTERN CORNER OF THE PROPERTY. ACCESS TO THE PARK WILL BE OFF OF S. QUEBEC STREET.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A PART OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO,

MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 21, THE SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER, A DISTANCE OF 834.64 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF CHERRY CREEK RECORDED IN BOOK 372 AT PAGE 568 AND 570; THENCE ON AN ANGLE TO THE RIGHT 127°01'56" AND ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 1393.30 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER; THENCE ON AN ANGLE TO THE RIGHT 143°11'56" AND ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 1112.28 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING,

COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO

10.656 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS APPROVAL

APPROVED BY THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, THIS _____ DAY OF _____ A.D., 20____.

CHAIR: _____

ATTEST: _____

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

NOT RECOMMENDED/RECOMMENDED BY THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION, THIS _____ DAY OF _____ A.D., 20____.

CHAIR: _____

CERTIFICATE OF OWNERSHIP

I, _____ HEREBY AFFIRM THAT I AM THE OWNER OR AUTHORIZED AGENT OF ALL INDIVIDUALS HAVING OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN, KNOWN AS CHERRY TREE ESTATES. CASE NO. Z15-001.

OWNER OF RECORD OR AUTHORIZED AGENT

STATE OF _____ }

S.S.

COUNTY OF _____ }

THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT WAS ACKNOWLEDGED BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 201____ BY _____

AS _____ OF _____ AN AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY.

BY _____ WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL
NOTARY PUBLIC

_____ ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES _____

CIVIL ENGINEER:



ROTH ENGINEERING GROUP
7853 EAST ARAPAHOE COURT, SUITE 2500
CENTENNIAL, CO 80112
PH: 303-841-9365
FAX: 303-648-5212
CONTACT : KEVIN ROTH

PLANNER:



KENDRICK CONSULTING
362 S. FAIRFAX ST.
DENVER, CO 80246
PH: 303-725-1255
CONTACT : MELISSA KENDRICK

OWNER:

CHERRY TREE ESTATES, LLC
P.O BOX 1352
ARVADA, CO 80001
PH: 303-888-5459
FAX: 303-432-2122
CONTACT: TIM VAN METER

ISSUE DATE: OCT. 22, 2015

SHEET INDEX

- 1 COVER
- 2 SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER:

1 OF 2

CHERRY TREE ESTATES


PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21,
TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO

LOTS 32-34
INDIAN CREEK
FILING No. 3
ZONING: P.U.D.
DENSITY: 7.3 DU/AC (PER INDIAN
CREEK P.U.D. PHASE NO. 4)



7853 E. ARAPAHOE COURT
SUITE 2500
CENTENNIAL, CO 80112
PHONE: 303-841-9365
FAX: 303-648-5212



DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA:

AREA	PLANNING AREA 1	PLANNING AREA 2	OVERALL TOTAL
SQUARE FEET/ ACRES/ % OF TOTAL	211,388.53 SF/ 4.853 AC/ 45.5%	252,784.71 SF/ 5.803 AC/ 54.5%	464,173.24 S.F/ 10.656 AC/ 100%
ZONING			
EXISTING	A-2	A-2	
PROPOSED	PUD: MKED USE	PUD: MKED USE	
PERMITTED USES			
PRINCIPAL USES	1. ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENCES. 2. SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED DWELLING UNIT.	1. ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENCES 2. SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED DWELLING UNIT. 3. SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED DWELLING UNIT.	
ACCESSORY USES	1. BUILDING AND USE CUSTOMARILY APPURTENANT TO THE PERMITTED USE. (SUCH AS GAZEBOS, SHEDS, ETC)	1. BUILDING AND USE CUSTOMARILY APPURTENANT TO THE PERMITTED USE. (SUCH AS GAZEBOS, SHEDS, ETC). 2. CLUBHOUSE 3. HOME OCCUPATION	
DENSITY			
EXISTING	N/A	N/A	
PROPOSED	2.10 D.U.* PER ACRE (MAX)	7.41 D.U.* ACRE (MAX)	4.98 D.U. ACRE (MAX)
DWELLING UNITS			
	10 D.U.* (MAX)	43 D.U.* (MAX)	53 D.U. (MAX)
BUILDING SETBACKS			
FROM NORTH PROPERTY LINE	20'-0"	20'-0"	
FROM EAST PROPERTY LINE	20'-0"	20'-0"	
FROM SOUTHEAST (DIAGONAL) PROPERTY LINE	20'-0"	20'-0"	
FROM INTERNAL LOT LINES	5'-0"	5'-0"	
COMMON WALLS LOT LINES	N/A	0'	
MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE OF STRUCTURE			
	50%	50%	
BUILDING SEPARATION			
FROM FRONT OF BUILDING TO ANOTHER BUILDING	30'-0" (MINIMUM)	30'-0" (MINIMUM)	
FROM SIDE TO ANOTHER SIDE	10'-0" (MINIMUM)	10'-0" (MINIMUM)	
FROM REAR OF BUILDING TO SIDE OR REAR OF ANOTHER BUILDING	20'-0" (MINIMUM)	20'-0" (MINIMUM)	
COMMON WALLS	N/A	0'-0"	
BUILDINGS -RESIDENTIAL			
MAXIMUM HEIGHT	32- FEET/ 2 STORIES	42- FEET/ 3 STORIES	
BUILDINGS -COMMUNITY			
MAXIMUM HEIGHT	32- FEET	32- FEET	
OPEN SPACE (COVERAGE)			
MINIMUM COVERAGE	35 PERCENT	35 PERCENT	35 PERCENT

* AN ASSISTED LIVING DWELLING UNIT INCLUDES A SINGLE STRUCTURE WITH UP TO 16 ASSISTED LIVING PATIENT BEDS.

CASE# Z15-001

NOTES:

- PROPOSED DRIVEWAY ACCESS CONNECTIONS THROUGH CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER (CITY) PROPERTY AND CONNECTING TO CITY RIGHT OF WAY AS APPROVED BY CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER. SITE ACCESS LOCATIONS SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE CONCEPTUAL. FINAL ACCESS LOCATIONS WILL BE DETERMINED WITH THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
- THIS PARCEL DOES CONTAIN LAND WITHIN A 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN AS DEFINED BY FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY (FEMA) FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP (FIRM) FOR ARAPAHOE COUNTY, MAP NUMBER 08005C0167K, DATED DECEMBER 17, 2010. FLOOD HAZARD AREA DELINEATION (DATED 10/20/13) HAS BEEN MODELED BY URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT AND IS PENDING APPROVAL BY FEMA WHICH WOULD REMOVE BOTH ACCESS POINTS AND ALL FLOODPLAIN SITE ENCUMBRANCES FROM THE REGULATORY/ FEMA 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN.
- AT LEAST ONE ACCESS TO THIS SITE SHALL BE LOCATED/ELEVATED OUTSIDE OF THE REGULATORY FLOODPLAIN, PRIOR TO THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
- DENSITIES ARE BASED UPON THE TOTAL LAND AREA OF THE PLANNING AREA PRESENTED HEREIN. FURTHER SUBDIVISION OF THE PLANNING AREA DOES NOT ALTER THE MAXIMUM YIELD OF DENSITY ANTICIPATED BY THIS DOCUMENT.
- A TRACT AND EASEMENT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR THE DETENTION FACILITY.

OFF STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS	
LAND USE	REQUIRED (MIN)
ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENCES	
RESIDENT SPACES	PER LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (**)
GUEST SPACES	
EMPLOYEE SPACES	
RESIDENTIAL HOUSING	
RESIDENT SPACES	PER LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE
GUEST SPACES	PER LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE
(**) MODIFICATIONS TO PARKING RATIOS MAY BE APPROVED WITH THE FDP	

LEGEND:

- EX PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- EX RIGHT-OF WAY-LINE
- EX SECTION LINE
- EX FENCE - BARBED WIRE
- EX STREET SIGN
- PR DETENTION POND
- EX FLOOD PLAIN (ONSITE)
- PR DRIVEWAY ACCESS

BASIS OF BEARINGS
BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE EAST LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 21 AND ARE ASSUMED TO BEAR SOUTH 00D04'03"E WITH ALL BEARINGS CONTAINED HEREIN RELATIVE THERETO.

SITE BENCHMARK
CITY & COUNTY OF DENVER BM 603; A BRASS CAP AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF QUEBEC AND JEWELL. ELEV=5417.73 (NAVD88)

CHERRY TREE ESTATES
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

CHERRY TREE ESTATES, LLC
P.O. BOX 1352
ARVADA, COLORADO 80001

ISSUE DATE:	12/15/15
BY	
REVISIONS	
DATE	

DESIGNED BY: KSR
DRAWN BY: JRF
JOB NUMBER: 130802

PLAN SCALE
60 0 60
HORIZONTAL SCALE: 1" = 60'
BAR IS 2 INCHES ON ORIGINAL DRAWING

SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER:
2 OF 2

ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
FEBRUARY 16, 2016
6:30 P.M.

SUBJECT: Z15-004 - XENIA STREET TOWNHOMES PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN


BILL SKINNER, SENIOR PLANNER

FEBRUARY 5, 2016

LOCATION & VICINITY MAP The site is located at 8850 E Mississippi Ave in the 4 Square Mile Area, on the southeast corner of the intersection of E. Mississippi Ave and S. Xenia St. This site is located in Commissioner's District No. 4.



Photo of Subject Property and Surrounding Area



Vicinity Map and Adjacent Zoning

ADJACENT SUBDIVISIONS, ZONING, AND LAND USES:

North of the subject property, across Mississippi Ave, is The Breakers, a multi-family attached residential development in the City and County of Denver.

South of the subject property, on both sides of the Xenia St. cul-de-sac are 10 single family detached lots and homes. Nine of these lot as are zoned R-3, and One is zoned R-A

East and abutting the subject property, is the Cinnamon Courtyard Homes multi-story condominium community. Cinnamon (this is the correct spelling) is zoned R-4 PUD, and was built at a density of 11 du/ac.

West of the subject property, across Xenia St., is the Arapahoe Green multi-family attached development. Arapahoe Green is zoned MU-PUD and was approved with a maximum density of 13.8 DU/ac.

PROPOSAL

The applicant, Phelps Engineering services, on behalf of the owner, 8850 Xenia LLC., is seeking approval of a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) known to the County as Case # Z15-004, Xenia Street Townhomes PDP.

The Z15-004 PDP application proposes rezoning the 1.48 acre (net) site from the existing R-A zoning to Residential Planned Unit Development – High Density (R-PH) with a specific max density of 21.6 du/ac gross, and 22.4 du/ac net.

BACKGROUND

The existing zoning is R-A. This zoning was approved by the County in 1961 as part of the County's initial establishment of zoning County wide.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

8850 E Mississippi Ave is the site of 4 existing single family detached houses with a collection of supporting detached garages and outbuildings.

DISCUSSION

Type of Housing Allowed In the R-PH Zone District

If approved, the proposed R-PH PUD zoning would allow for single-family detached, single-family attached, multi-family, or any combination of the above housing types.

Parking

The PDP specifies parking requirements to be met by any subsequent FDP. Additional information about the parking design will be reviewed as part of the FDP process. The PDP document sets the level of parking to be provided at no fewer than 2 dedicated parking spaces, and 0.25 guest spaces per unit which does comply with Arapahoe County regulations for this type and level of development.

Density

The applicant has requested approval of a R-PH Residential High Density PUD. The proposed maximum 22.4 du/ac is aligned with R-PH density regulations which specify a minimum of 11 du/ac., but would be higher than the 11 du/ac density multi-family development existing east of the site, and the 13.8 du/ac density multi-family development existing west of the site.

The proposed density is significantly higher than that of the 10 existing single family detached properties existing south of the site. These 10 properties are all similarly sized and average 1.1 du/ac.

Maximum Height

The PDP proposes a 38' maximum building height.

Compatibility with the Surrounding Area

The proposal for 22.4 du/ac, while complying with the underlying sub-area plan recommendation, is more dense than the surrounding development, and the surrounding PUD zoning as approved by those PDPs, and is significantly more dense than the 1.1 du/ac existing on the single family lots south of the site. The staff considers the potential for redevelopment of the surrounding properties when evaluating a rezoning application, and it should be noted that the

10 homes existing south of this proposal are in an location the 4 Square Mile Sub Area Plan recommends remain single family detached with a density of no more than 6 du/ac.

The difference in density between the proposed development and the single-family homes existing south of the site is exacerbated by the 10' setback proposed on the southern border of the subject property. If the 10' setback is considered in concert with the proposed 38' maximum building height limitation there is a potential for incompatibility issues between the proposed PDP standards and the adjacent R-3 properties which have are limited to 2.1 du/ac and 25' max building height.

ANALYSIS OF Z15-004 PDP APPLICATION

Staff review of this application included a comparison of the proposal to applicable policies and goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, a review of pertinent zoning regulations, local background activity, and an analysis of referral comments.

1. The Comprehensive Plan

The Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan and the 4 Square Mile Area Sub-Area Plan designate this site as "Multi-family". On page 6 of the appendix in the 4 Square Mile Area Sub-Area Plan (adopted February 15, 2005); the density range specified for multi-family development is "from 13 to 25 units per gross acre". This PDP proposes 32 units homes at a max density of 22.4 units per acre. The proposed density is near, but does not exceed the high end of the range recommended in the Sub Area Plan.

This plan proposes no more than 32 homes within walkable distance of commercial uses such as the grocery stores, neighborhood commercial/retail services, the Challenge School, and the shopping center existing approximately ½ mile away on Havana St. In this regard, this proposal is aligned with the goals of **Policy NH 1.2 – Promote a Diversity of Housing types in Growth Areas Countywide** and **Policy NH 3.1 – Support New Affordable Housing Opportunities and Retain Existing Affordable Housing in Growth Areas**, as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.

2. Land Development Code Review – PDP Z14-007

Section 13-100, Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) of the Land Development Code, states that "the P.U.D. process is intended to prevent the creation of a monotonous urban landscape by allowing for the mixture of uses which might otherwise be considered non-compatible, through the establishment of flexible development standards", provided said standards:

- a. *Recognize the limitations of existing and planned infrastructure, by thorough examination of the availability and capability of water, sewer, drainage, and transportation systems to serve present and future land uses.*

The site is located adjacent to E Mississippi Ave which provides automobile access to nearby arterial roadways. RTD bus service is available on E Mississippi St, and also on E Florida St and on Havana St 1/2 miles south and east of the site respectively.

The Engineering Services Division has evaluated the proposal in light of the existing and proposed infrastructure and has determined that it is adequate to support the proposed use. The applicant reports that water, sewer, storm drainage utilities are also present in the adjacent right of ways.

Right-of-way dedication is necessary for this project and will be dedicated by a plat in a related process at a later date.

A “will serve” letter has been provided by the Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District and is included in this report.

- b. *Assure compatibility between the proposed development, surrounding land uses and the natural environment.*

This site exists in a neighborhood that is primarily residential, with the majority of housing being either multi-family development, but some single-family detached homes on 0.9 acre lots exist in the immediate vicinity. Forms of ownership span the range from rental walk-up apartments to owner-occupied detached houses. In addition to the residential properties, there are some commercial businesses and places of worship, schools, and child care providers in the nearby surrounding area.

The staff has some concern that while the type of use appears to be compatible, there is a potential for the relatively small setbacks when combined with a proposed 38’ maximum building height may create undue imposition on the adjacent properties east and south of the proposal. This concern is supported by the following design guidelines section of the County’s Land Development Code (italicized text represents areas that are particularly applicable);

15-106.01 Cohesive, Well-Planned Development

C. Open Spaces and Connectivity:

1. Goals of open spaces in residential areas include:

g. *Provide buffers and open space between buildings and/or developments;*

E. Building Height and Setbacks

1. Building heights and setbacks are established at the time of development application review.

2. Building heights should avoid the perception that individual buildings are out of scale with the size of their lots *or with neighboring buildings*, and should avoid unnecessary snow shadowing of neighboring buildings and public rights-of-way.

F. Transition – *Developments are encouraged to display transitional elements when less-compatible uses are adjacent to one another.*

The natural environment has been thoroughly subjugated and no longer exists in this area. It should be noted that even long time vacant properties are not representative of the “natural” environment, as the land in this area has been used for a variety of land altering uses for many years. Examples of these uses would be keeping horses, goats, and other livestock or the cultivation of non-native plants either for agricultural production or the establishment of lawns. There are no remaining vestiges of the short grass and bunch grass prairie vegetation that would have occupied this area before permanent human settlement and occupation.

- c. *Allow for the efficient and adequate provision of public services. Applicable public services include, but are not limited to, police, fire, school, parks, and libraries.*

The proposal as submitted can be served by existing public services as evidenced by referral agency responses with the exception of park facilities. The Arapahoe County Open space Department's referral response expresses concerns that this proposal will be underserved by local parks, and that an on-site playground should be provided.

- d. *Enhance convenience for the present and future residents of Arapahoe County by ensuring that appropriate supporting activities, such as employment, housing, leisure-time, and retail centers are in close proximity to one another.*

The proposal is located within acceptable proximity to employment and retail centers. These centers and the businesses that inhabit them are located along Havana Street approximately ½ mile east of the site and Parker Road approximately 1 mile west of this site.

- e. *Ensure that public health and safety is adequately protected against natural and man-made hazards, which include, but are not limited to, traffic noise, water pollution, airport hazards, and flooding.*

The proposal adequately protects against natural and man-made hazards as evidenced by the Arapahoe County Engineering Services Division Report and referral agency responses. The applicant reports that "site disturbance will be minimized to the greatest extent possible during the design and construction process."

- f. *Provide for accessibility within the proposed development, and between the development and existing adjacent uses. Adequate on-site interior traffic circulation, public transit, pedestrian avenues, parking and thoroughfare connections are all factors to be examined when determining the accessibility of a site.*

At this time nothing more than proposed points of access are available for review. Per Section 13-107, Item M of the Land Development Code, a PDP may indicate conceptual points of access. A detailed analysis of any internal roadways will be conducted when a subsequent site plan proposal is submitted.

The proposal is adjacent to an existing RTD public transportation bus route. There is an existing bus stop one block west of the site on Mississippi St.

- g. *Minimize disruption to existing physiographic features, including vegetation, streams, lakes, soil types and other relevant topographical elements.*

No significant physiographic features exist on or adjacent to this site.

- h. *Ensure that the amenities provided adequately enhance the quality of life in the area, by creating a comfortable and aesthetically enjoyable environment through conventions such as, the preservation of mountain views, the creation of landscaped open areas, and the establishment of recreational activities.*

The proposed PDP sets requirements in the form of a 35% minimum open space requirement. Additional detail in the form of landscape plans, vegetation specifications, and architectural elevations will be required with a Final Development Plan if the PDP is approved and development proceeds.

The development site is located approximately 1 mile east of the Highline Canal Recreational Trail. The Highline Canal Trail is part of the Denver Urban Area network of trails and connects directly to many of the area's significant bike/pedestrian trail corridors as well as regional park facilities.

Impacts to mountain views will be similar to impacts created by any of the wide variety of structures existing in the area, but the proposed 38' maximum building height will be taller than structures existing on adjacent properties.

- i. *Enhance the usable open spaces in Arapahoe County, and provide sufficient unobstructed open spaces and recreational areas to accommodate a project's residents and employees.*

The proposed PDP meets the County requirement for 35% open space to be provided exclusive of public rights-of-way and detention areas if multi-family housing is proposed. The staff notes that the applicant may opt to provide cash in lieu of dedicated park lands, and that a County Park does exist 3/4 mile southwest of the site. This park is available for use by the future residents of this development.

The PDP criteria, just stated, must be addressed prior to approval of (a PDP) request, and are intended to provide clarity of purpose and direction for applicants, neighbors, concerned citizens, and Arapahoe County decision-makers.

3. Referral Comments

Comments received during the referral process are as follows: *All applicant or staff responses are in Italics.*

Arapahoe County Planning	Comments have been addressed
Arapahoe County Engineering Services Division	Comments and TRC concerns have been addressed
Arapahoe County Mapping	Comments have been addressed
Arapahoe County Building Division	No details to review – <i>(will review at time of FDP)</i>
Arapahoe County Zoning	No comment
Arapahoe County Sheriff	No comment
Cunningham Fire Protection District	Technical comments to be addressed at the time of a site plan <i>(see attached letter)</i>
Library District	A portion of the cash in lieu is requested <i>(to be collected at the time of plat of site plan)</i>
City and County of Denver	No response
Post Office	No response
Arapahoe County Open Space Division	Requests that the cash-in-lieu be assessed by the appraised value method, and a states that a small playground shall be provided (the design of the playground to be considered at the time of FDP)
Cherry Creek School District	Deferred comment until site plan
Tri-County Health Department	Proper must be followed when abandoning existing septic facilities and demolishing existing buildings.
Colorado Geological Survey	No response

West Arapahoe Conservation District	No response
CDOT Region 6 Access	No response
RTD	No response
Century Link	No response
XCEL Energy	A letter explaining developer's responsibilities is attached.
Army Corps of Engineers	No response
Colorado Division of Water Resources	A will serve letter from the local water district has satisfied CDoWR requirements.
SEMSWA	Comments have been addressed
Urban Drainage	No response
Four Square Mile Area Neighbors (4SMN)	The combination of the requested 38' max building height and 10' setback to southern property line is a matter of concern
Cinnimon HOA	No response

STAFF FINDINGS

Staff has visited the site, reviewed the plans, supporting documentation, referral comments, and citizen input in response to this application. Based upon review of applicable policies and goals in the Comprehensive Plan, review of the development regulations and analysis of referral comments, our findings include:

1. The proposed PDP conforms with the overall goals and intent of Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan and the 4 Square Mile Area Sub Are Plan in regard to the policies set forth in those plans, as adopted February 15, 2005.
2. The Z15-004 PDP is generally consistent with development standards enumerated in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code, but could make additional commitments regarding buffering and site specific restrictions that would ensure increased compatibility with the single family zoning existing south of the site.
3. The proposed Z14-004 PDP complies with the process outlined in Chapter 13-100, Planned Unit Development of the Land Development Code.

RECOMMENDATION

Considering the findings and other information provided herein, Staff recommends approval of case numbers Z15-004 Xenia Street Townhomes Preliminary Development Plan subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Prior to signature of the final mylar copy of these plans, the applicant agrees to address Public Works Staff comments including concerns identified in the most recent Engineering Staff Report.
2. The developer shall provide a recreational amenity to be specified at the times of FDP.
3. The developer shall provide a transition to mitigate impacts on the lower density and lower height single-family detached south of the site.

DRAFT MOTIONS

Recommend Conditional Approval

(This motion is consistent with the staff recommendation): In the case of Z15-004 Xenia Street Townhomes Preliminary Development Plan, the Commissioners have read the staff report. We find ourselves in agreement with staff findings 1 through 3, including all plans and attachments as set forth in the staff report dated February 5, 2016, and recommend approval of these applications subject to the following condition:

1. Prior to signature of the final mylar copy of these plans, the applicant agrees to address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.

Staff provides the following Draft Motions as guidance in preparing an alternative motion if the Board of County Commissioners reaches a different determination:

Recommend Denial:

(This motion is not consistent with the staff recommendation): In the case of Z15-004 Xenia Street Townhomes Preliminary Development Plan, the Commissioners have read the staff report dated February 5, 2016, and received testimony at the public hearing. Based on the information presented and considered during a public hearing, we recommend denial of the applications, based on the following findings:

1. *State new findings as part of the motion.*
2. ...

Continue to Date Certain: In the case of Z15-004 Xenia Street Townhomes Preliminary Development Plan, I move to continue the hearing to [date], 6:30 p.m., to obtain additional information and to further consider the information presented.

Attachments:

Application & Exhibits
Engineering Staff Report
Referral Comments



Public Works and Development
 6924 S. Lima Street
 Centennial, Colorado 80112
 Phone: 720-874-6650 FAX 720-874-6611
www.arapahoegov.com

**Land Development Application
 Formal**

Form must be complete

Land Development Application material received after 2pm shall be date stamped as received the following working day.

APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE: 8850 Xenia LLC	ADDRESS: 1201 S. Parker Road, #200 Denver, CO 80231 PHONE: 303-946-1153 FAX: 303-283-3102 EMAIL: scott@alpertdevelopment.com	SIGNATURE: <i>[Signature]</i> NAME: Scott Alpert TITLE: Managing Member
OWNER(S) OF RECORD: 8850 Xenia LLC	ADDRESS: 1201 S. Parker Road, #200 Denver, CO 80231 PHONE: 303-946-1153 FAX: 303-283-3102 EMAIL: scott@alpertdevelopment.com	SIGNATURE: <i>[Signature]</i> NAME: Scott Alpert TITLE: Managing Member
ENGINEERING FIRM: Phelps Engineering Services, Inc.	ADDRESS: 7200 E. Hampden Ave., Suite 300 Denver, CO 80224 PHONE: 303-669-2314 FAX: 303-298-1645 EMAIL: lphelps@phelpsengineering.net	CONTACT PERSON: Lonny Phelps

Pre-Submittal Case Number: **14-043** Pre-Submittal Planner: **Bill Skinner** Pre-Submittal Engineer: **Spencer Smith**

Parcel ID no. (AIN no.)	1973-21-1-00-047
Address:	8850 E. Mississippi Ave., Denver, CO 80247
Subdivision Name & Filing:	

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zoning:	R-A	R-PH
Case/Project/Subdivision Name:		Xenia St. Townhomes
Site Area (Acres):	1.48	1.48
Floor Area Ratio (FAR):		
Density (Dwelling Units/Acre):	2.7	21.7
Building Square Footage:		
Disturbed Area (Acres):	N/A	1.48
Related Case Numbers: (Final/Preliminary Development Plan, Rezoning, and/or Plat)		

CASE TYPE				
1041- Areas & Activities of State Interest	Location & Extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preliminary Development Plan	Special District/Title 30
1041- Areas & Activities of State Interest – Use by Special Review	Location & Extent – Major Amendment		Preliminary Development Plan – Major Amendment	Special District/Title 32
Comprehensive Plan	Master Development Plan		Preliminary Plat	Street Name Change
Final Development Plan	Master Development Plan – Major Amendment		Replat - Major	Use by Special Review
Final Development Plan – Major Amendment	Minor Subdivision		Rural Cluster	Use by Special Review – Major Amendment
Final Plat	Planned Sign Program		Rezoning Conventional	Use by Special Review – Oil & Gas
Land Development Code Amendment	Planned Sign Program – Major Amendment		Rezoning Conventional – Major Amendment	Vacation of Right-of-Way/Easement/Plat

THIS SECTION FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Case No:		Planning Manager:		Engineering Manager:			
Planning Fee:	Y	N	\$	Engineering Fee:	Y	N	\$

This application shall be submitted with all applicable application fees. Submittal of this application does not establish a vested property right in accordance with C.R.S. 24-68-105(1). Processing and review of this application may require the submittal of additional information, subsequent reviews, and/or meetings, as outlined in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code.



LETTER OF INTENT

August 3, 2015

Phelps Engineering Services, Inc.
7200 East Hampden Avenue, Suite 300
Denver, CO 80224

RE: Xenia Street Townhomes, Case No. Z14-043

Dear Public Works and Development:

Our Company, Phelps Engineering Services, Inc. on behalf of the property owner, 8850 Xenia LLC, is proposing a project within unincorporated Arapahoe County. The project is located at 8850 East Mississippi Avenue, the southeast corner of the intersection of East Mississippi Avenue and Xenia Street, Parcel ID #1973-21-1-00-047. The project includes 1.48 Acres (64,291 square feet) and is currently zoned R-A.

The Xenia Street Townhomes project will consist of 32 townhomes on 1.48 acres at the southeast corner of East Mississippi Avenue and South Xenia Street. Our plan is that these units will be luxury townhomes and will attract a vibrant class of residents to the area. Amenities will include a professionally landscaped park-like common area, open space, walking paths, and parking for visitors. The townhomes themselves will be 2 to 4 bedrooms with 2-car garages, decks/patios, and upgraded interior finishes.

We believe our plan for this area will have a very positive impact on all surrounding homes, townhomes, and businesses. Our project will replace a blighted, eyesore property, strewn with dilapidated and potentially dangerous buildings, dirt piles, and old vehicles with modern construction that serves an upwardly mobile demographic that contributes to the community.

The developer of the project is:

Scott Alpert, Managing Member
8850 Xenia LLC
1201 South Parker Road, #200
Denver, CO 80231
Phone: 303-946-1153, Fax: 303-283-3102

Sincerely,

Phelps Engineering Services, Inc.

Lonny E. Phelps, P.E.
President

Planning Commission Summary Report

Date: February 2, 2016 *SMS*
To: Arapahoe County Planning Commission
Through: Bill Skinner
Planning Division, Case Planner
Through: Chuck Haskins, PE
Engineering Services Division, Manager
From: Spencer M. Smith, PE
Engineering Services Division, Case Engineer

Case name: Z15-004 – Xenia Street Townhomes - PDP

Purpose and Recommendation

The purpose of this report is to communicate the Engineering Staff findings, comments, and recommendations regarding the land use application identified above.

Engineering Staff has reviewed the land use application and has the following findings:

1. The site is part of the Westerly Creek drainage basin. On-site stormwater detention and water quality are required for this site. Detailed drainage design will be included with the Phase III Drainage Report when the Final Development Plans are submitted to the County for review.
2. The applicant presented two waiver requests to the County's Technical Review Committee (TRC) on December 17, 2014. Both requests were in regards to road right-of-way (ROW) dedication requirements. TRC approved of both requests by the applicant.
 - a. E. Mississippi Ave. – The ultimate road right-of-way for E. Mississippi Ave. is 144' (72' on each side of the section line). Adjacent to the proposed Xenia Street Townhome site there is currently 40' of ROW. To meet the full ultimate ROW width, the applicant would be required to dedicate an additional 32' to the County. The applicant requested that the County accept dedication of an additional 20' of ROW along their project frontage, for a total of 60'. The 60' of ROW would match what exists currently along the Cinnamon Down the Street development (east) frontage and exceed the 55' of ROW along the Arapahoe Green development (west) frontage.
 - b. S. Xenia St. - Adjacent to the proposed Xenia Street Townhome site there is currently 40' of ROW. County staff requested ROW dedication of an additional 10' along the Xenia St. Townhome project site, to contain the proposed roadway section. The applicant requested that the County allow dedication of a Public Use and Signage Easement along the project frontage in lieu of dedicating additional ROW. The easement would vary from 3' – 7' in width, and would contain the portions of the 5' attached sidewalk that are outside of the existing ROW and also a 2' strip for signage purposes. This is consistent with the requirements of the

County for the property on the west side of Xenia Street (Arapahoe Green apartment complex).

Engineering Staff is recommending the land use application favorably with no conditions.



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development - Planning Division

6924 S. Lima Street, Centennial, CO 80112

Phone: 720-874-6650 | Fax: 720-874-6611

www.arapahoegov.com

Phase II Referral Routing

Agency Receiving Referral: Arapahoe County Open Spaces

Agency Contact Person: Roger Harvey

Case Number: Z15-004 Preliminary development Plan

Case Name: Xenia Street Townhomes

Case Planner: Bill Skinner - BSkinner@arapahoegov.com

Case Engineer: Spencer Smith - SSmith@arapahoegov.com

Date Sent: 11/02/2015

Date to be Returned: 11/13/2015

INSTRUCTIONS:

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate box, sign, add comments as necessary and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

COMMENTS:

Reviewer First & Last Name:

Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted

Have the following comments to make related to the case:

Ray Winn/Roger Harvey - Planning

Please See Attached Letter.



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PROTECT. CONNECT. ENJOY.

November 13, 2015

Bill Skinner
Public Works and Development
6924 S. Lima Street
Centennial CO, 80112

RE: Planning Case # Z15-004 Xenia Street Townhomes

Dear Mr. Skinner:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the submittal by Xenia Street Townhomes for the preliminary development plan. Arapahoe County Open Spaces Department and Arapahoe County Recreation District staff (ACOS/ACRD) has the following comments:

1. This area is identified by the Four Square Mile Neighborhood Recreation Needs and Opportunities Assessment (4SQM Assessment) as an isolated area having no recreational services . See Zone 1 in the map below.
2. The recreational needs of the residents of the 4SQM Neighborhood are being dramatically amplified due to increased population growth and increased building density. The increased density from this and other developments in the immediate area increases the population that has no recreational services and thus increases the need.
3. The 4SQM Assessment also indicates that "Several areas have no walkable access to recreation at all including a substantial area of high population density in the northeast of the study area south of Mississippi Avenue." S. Xenia Street exacerbates this problem by lacking sidewalks and is a dead end to the south with no walkable, bikeable access south, users must travel north onto E. Mississippi Avenue to travel approx. 1 mile to Cheyene/Arapaho Park, the closest public park. This distance is longer then Professional Park planning norms, which attempt to attain at most one half mile as a walkable distance.
4. The 4SQM Assessment identifies this area as a high priority for future service improvements.

Based on the information stated above ACOS/ACRD staff has the following recommendations for approval:

1. At minimum the applicant shall provide a small playground area and play equipment on site similar to the property the west side of Xenia Street (see picture) in accordance with Development Regulation 14-111.07. This will provide recreation for very young, small children. The addition of this private park improvement may be credited against the park dedication requirements set forth in subdivision regulations 14-111.



ARAPAHOE COUNTY
PROTECT. CONNECT. ENJOY.

2. The applicant shall provide a 10' detached sidewalk along E. Mississippi Ave and sidewalk along S. Xenia St.
3. The Land Development Code land dedication for parkland would be 0.338 acres or cash in lieu of land formula. The Assumed Value method that is commonly used to determine the sum of money will result in an amount that is far less than current fair market value, and far less than the Appraisal Method. ACOS/ACRD requests that the Appraisal Method be considered and utilized for determining fair market value.

There reason for the Appraisal Method request is new higher density development occurring in 4SQ mile neighborhood generates a need for additional park amenities. ACOS/ACRD is working to increase the amenities in the neighborhood; recently acquiring new parkland and moving forward with planning and development of new parks. The cost for park development and land acquisition has increased dramatically, and only the Appraisal Method will create an amount roughly proportional to the burden imposed on ACOS/ACRD which is responsible for creating and providing new amenities.


ACOS/ACRD is willing to further discuss our recommendations with applicant and assist in any way we can.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application.

Roger Harvey & Ray Winn

Open Spaces Planning

Cc Shannon Carter



Map 8: Isolates areas with no service or low service, below threshold as indicated. The brighter yellow areas are close to reaching the threshold value of 48.0. Dull yellow areas are still developing, while grey areas have no service at all.





ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development - Planning Division

6924 S. Lima Street, Centennial, CO 80112

Phone: 720-874-6650 | Fax: 720-874-6611

www.arapahoegov.com

Phase II Referral Routing

Agency Receiving Referral:	
Agency Contact Person:	
<p>Case Number: Z15-004 Preliminary development Plan</p> <p>Case Name: Xenia Street Townhomes</p> <p>Case Planner: Bill Skinner - BSkinner@arapahoegov.com</p> <p>Case Engineer: Spencer Smith - SSmith@arapahoegov.com</p>	
<p>Date Sent:</p> <p>Date to be Returned:</p>	
<p>INSTRUCTIONS: The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate box, sign, add comments as necessary and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.</p>	
COMMENTS:	Reviewer First & Last Name:
<input type="checkbox"/> Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted	
<input type="checkbox"/> Have the following comments to make related to the case:	

CHERRY CREEK VALLEY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT
2325 SOUTH WABASH STREET
DENVER, COLORADO 80231
(303) 755-4474

PAUL J. HANLEY, Chairman
MARK L. LAMPERT, Vice Chairman
WILLIAM M. MACPHEE, Secretary/Treasurer
FREDERICK L. NORMAN, Director
BRADLEY W. RASTALL, Director

AVAILABILITY OF SERVICE LETTER

December 9, 2015

Frank Feero, P.E.
Phelps Engineering


Re: Xenia Street Townhomes – S Xenia St & E Mississippi Ave

The above referenced property is within the service area of the District. The District is a Master Meter Distributor for Denver Water. Water and sewer service is available subject to extension of water and sewer lines, payment of all fees, and the District's Rules and Regulations.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

CHERRY CREEK VALLEY WATER
AND SANITATION DISTRICT



John R. Warford
Manager



CUNNINGHAM FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

2015 SOUTH DAYTON STREET ♦ DENVER, CO 80247 ♦ Phone: (303) 755-9202
Fax: (303) 337-7971

PDP Comment

November 3, 2015

Bill Skinner-Planner
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 S. Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Re: Xenia Street Townhomes

Mr. Skinner:

The Fire District has reviewed the referral for the above referenced case for compliance with the *2009 International Fire Code (IFC)* as adopted by the District. The Fire District supports the PDP for approval with the following comments and requirements.

To support the PDP the following would need to be clarified:

- Due to the buildings being over 30-feet in height an additional access would be required per 2009 IFC D104.1 **Buildings exceeding three stories or 30 feet in height.** Buildings or facilities exceeding 30 feet (9144 mm) or three stories in height shall have at least two means of fire apparatus access for each structure.
 - Only one access is noted on these plans from Mississippi.
 - Additional access would be required or building height would need to be lowered.

The following notes would be needed on the FDP Plan for Review and Approval:

The Fire District requires that the following general comments are included on the cover sheet of the FDP:

1. Fire Department Access:
 1. Surfaced access roads capable of withstanding the imposed loads of fire apparatus and all required hydrants shall be installed prior to construction.
 2. All roads and drives are hereby designated as fire lanes. When required by the Fire District, all fire lanes shall be posted "No Parking – Fire Lane." All fire lanes shall be included in the Arapahoe County program for enforcement of private property parking.

3. Turning radius and navigation through the development shall meet the Cunningham Fire Protection Districts specifications and is verified using an approved method. (Auto-Cad drawings must be provided, vehicle information can be found on our website www.cfpd.org)
4. Any proposed “pork-chop” or any traffic direction features at the entrance of the development shall have a designed width of 16 feet minimum drive with mountable curbs and no obstructions to the entrances.
5. If a traffic signal is added as part of this development it is required to have a opticom traffic device installed.
6. If the proposed structures are 30-feet in height the fire department access drives within the development shall be a minimum of 26-feet in width.
7. The fire apparatus access road shall comply with the requirements of *Section 503* and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. Plan demonstrating the structures meet the *Section 503* requirement.
8. All fire hydrants are to be installed in conformance with *Sections 507 and Appendix C* of the *2009 International Fire Code*. No landscaping, fencing or any other obstruction shall be placed within three feet of a fire hydrant.

1. Fire lane designation

All private drives within this development are declared as fire apparatus access under *Section 503 of the 2009 IFC*. The fire apparatus access road shall comply with the requirements of *Section 503* and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. Submit a plan demonstrating the structure meets the *Section 503* requirement.

2. Fire lane identification

The Fire District declares all drives within this development as fire apparatus access under *Section 503* of the *2009 IFC*. Any roadway that is 30-feet or less in width shall be marked as a fire lane on both sides; roadways 30-34 feet in width shall be marked as a fire lane on one side. Information on the Arapahoe County Fire Lane Program will be provided to the Developer. If the proposed structures are 30-feet in height the fire department access drives within the development shall be a minimum of 26-feet in width. **Fire lane plan shall be submitted and entered into the Arapahoe County Fire Lane Program.**

3. Water plan

A formal water plan for review and approval with a fee is required for any new fire hydrant installations and the fire service line prior to issuance of any Fire District building permits. Submittal of a copy of the water plan submitted to the Cherry Creek Valley Water and

Sanitation District (CCVWSD) during their required approval process directly to the Fire District for review is acceptable.

4. Building construction plans

Complete specifications and building construction plans shall be submitted directly to the Fire District for review and approval at the same time plans are submitted to the building department and prior to any building construction occurring. **The developer is encouraged to contact the Cunningham Fire Prevention Bureau to verify plan submittal requirements and permit fees prior to plan submittal.**

5. Fire Sprinkler System

The installation of a fire sprinkler system is required due to limited access. The sprinkler system shall meet the requirements of *National Fire Protection Association standard NFPA 13, Installation of Sprinkler Systems*.

6. Fire Alarm System

The installation of an approved fire alarm system is required if the fire sprinkler system is required. The fire alarm system shall meet the requirements of *National Fire Protection Association standard NFPA 72, National Fire Alarm Code*.

If you need any additional information or have any questions, please contact me at (303) 338-4204. The Fire Prevention Bureau fax number is (303) 337-7971.

Sincerely,

Tyler Everitt
Deputy Fire Marshal

Cunningham Fire Protection District – received via email on 12/9/2016

Good Morning Bill,

I wanted to provide clarification to the Fire District's comments. Per my conversation with Scott Alpert today all of these townhomes will be protected with a fire sprinkler system throughout all buildings. This being said they are allowed to have one access (Mississippi Ave/Xenia) per the fire code and the fire district would support the PDP with the additional information provided.

Scott, since the buildings would be over 30ft in height you would still need to provide Aerial Access and a Fire Lane signage plan for approval

SECTION D105 AERIAL FIRE APPARATUS ACCESS ROADS

D105.1 Where required. Buildings or portions of buildings or facilities exceeding 30 feet (9144 mm) in height above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access shall be provided with *approved* fire apparatus access roads capable of accommodating fire department aerial apparatus. Overhead utility and power lines shall not be located within the aerial fire apparatus access roadway.

D105.2 Width. Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet (7925 mm), exclusive of shoulders, in the immediate vicinity of any building or portion of building more than 30 feet (9144 mm) in height.

D105.3 Proximity to building. At least one of the required access routes meeting this condition shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet (4572 mm) and a maximum of 30 feet (9144 mm) from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building.

Thank you,

Tyler Everitt
Deputy Fire Marshal
Cunningham Fire Protection District
303-338-4204



December 1, 2015

Bill Skinner
Arapahoe County Planning Division
Arapahoe County Lima Plaza
6924 S Lima St
Centennial CO 80112

RE: Xenia Street Townhomes
Case No. Z15-004
TCHD Case No. 3734

Dear Mr. Skinner:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Xenia Street Townhomes Preliminary Development Plan located at the Southeast corner of E Mississippi Ave. and S Xenia St. Tri-County Health Department (TCHD) staff has reviewed the application for compliance with applicable public and environmental health regulations and principles of healthy community design. After reviewing the application, TCHD has the following comments.

Historic On-Site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) Abandonment

According to TCHD's records, there was a historic septic tank that was serving the houses at both 8850 E Mississippi Ave and 1110 S Xenia St. Our records indicate that the septic tank was abandoned in 2002.

Proper abandonment of a septic tank requires the following:

- Confirming that the tank is empty. If any liquids remain in the tank, the tank shall be pumped dry by a system cleaner licensed by TCHD.
- Once the septic tank has been pumped dry, it may either be backfilled with soil, crushed and buried on the site, or excavated and disposed in a permitted solid waste disposal facility.
- Provide written notice to of the septic tank abandonment, along with a pump receipt, to TCHD.

In order to prevent contamination of groundwater or exposure to contaminated soils, TCHD recommends that the applicant identify the septic tank and ensure that it has been properly abandoned before construction starts.

Demolition of Buildings

It appears that there are multiple homes currently on the site that will be demolished in order to construct townhomes. The demolition of buildings can affect air quality and can create vector control issues.

Xenia Street Townhomes, Z15-004

December 1, 2015

Page 2 of 2

Air Quality

The application indicates that the existing building on the site will be demolished. State air quality regulations require that precautions be taken prior to demolition of buildings to evaluate the presence of asbestos fibers that may present a health risk. If such fibers are present, actions must be taken to prevent their release into the environment. State regulations also address control of ozone depleting compounds (chlorofluorocarbons) that may be contained in air conditioning or refrigerating equipment. The applicant shall contact the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) Air Pollution Control Division at (303) 692-3100 for more information. Additional information is available at:

<http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/ap/asbestos>.

Vector Control

Rodents such as mice and rats carry diseases which can be spread to humans through contact with rodents, rodent feces, urine, or saliva, or through rodent bites. If there is an infestation of rodents in the building proposed for demolition, the infestation should be eliminated prior to demolition to prevent the spread of rodents to neighboring properties. Information on rodent control can be found at <http://www.tchd.org/400/Rodent-Control>.

Please feel free to contact me at (720) 200-1585 or lbroten@tchd.org if you have any questions regarding TCHD's comments.

Sincerely,



Laurel Broten, MPH
Land Use and Built Environment Specialist
Tri-County Health Department

CC: Sheila Lynch, Steve Chevalier, TCHD



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: **303.571.3306**
Facsimile: 303. 571.3284
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

November 12, 2015

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Attn: Bill Skinner

Re: Xenia Street Townhomes, Case # Z15-004

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the preliminary development plans for **Xenia Street Townhomes**. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing electric facilities within the subject property. The property owner/developer/contractor must contact the **Builder's Call Line at 1-800-628-2121** and complete the application process for any new gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities including relocation and/or removal. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements will need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the **Utility Notification Center, at 1-800-922-1987** to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

Should you have any questions with this referral response, please contact me at 303-571-3306.

Donna George
Contract Right of Way Referral Processor
Public Service Company of Colorado

FOUR SQUARE MILE NEIGHBORHOODS

c/o Mark Lampert
9022 East Colorado Drive
Denver, CO 80231

January 25, 2016

Via Email

Mr. Bill Skinner
Arapahoe County Planning

Re: Xenia St. Townhomes PDP Application, Z15-004

Dear Bill:

Four Square Mile Neighborhoods (4SQM) provides the following comments with respect to this proposed three-story townhome development.

The proposed development consists of four three-story buildings, each with a height of 38 feet, that are perpendicularly situated to Xenia Street—the front of the property. It appears that the fourth building on the south side of the property is set back only 10 feet from the property line. This unusual configuration results in a 38-foot tall building running from the front to the back of the property only 10 feet from the south side property line.

Xenia Street is a transitional area, with multi-family developments on the north side along Mississippi Street and transitioning to some primarily older, single family homes (although one newer single family home exists) as the street heads towards its dead end to the south.

The issue we have is that the placement of southern most perpendicular three-story building that is 38 feet in height directly next to a property boundary running from the front to the back of the property with only a 10-foot setback is inconsistent with the surrounding property. It fails to provide an appropriate transition to the adjacent and nearby properties, some of which are single family homes.

Neighbors towards the south end of the street mentioned that when Devon Square apartments were built next to the south end of the street, the neighbors were able to persuasively convince planners that the Devon Square apartments should be terraced so that lower buildings were closer to Xenia Street, leading up to taller three story buildings. The net result is a more appropriate transition.

Terracing in transition areas has also occurred in other transitions from multi-family to single family areas on 4SQM. For example, Lugano (formerly Prospect Village) on Iliff is set back far from nearby Huntington Estates and is terraced up from two stories in height as the development is situated further from the adjacent single family neighborhood.

A similar concept should be employed with regard to this proposed development.

Bill Skinner
Arapahoe County Planning
January 25, 2016
Page 2

Other than our ongoing concern that multi-family development in this part of 4SQM should be scaled back due to overcrowded roads and lack of open space in the area, at this time, the maximum height of this perpendicularly-situated building that is so near the south side boundary to the adjacent property in a transitional area is our only concern. We may have additional comments as the plans become more definite and review the proposed FDP—particularly the more detailed appearance and design of the perpendicularly- situated buildings.

Very Truly Yours,

FOUR SQUARE MILE NEIGHBORHOODS


By Mark Lampert

cc: Jan Yeckes, Arapahoe County

XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES

PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

LOCATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRICIPAL MERIDIAN



VICINITY MAP
SCALE 1=2000

CERTIFICATE OF OWNERSHIP

I 8850 XENIA LLC BY SCOTT ALPERT MANAGER HEREBY AFFIRM THAT I AM THE OWNER OR AUTHORIZED AGENT OF ALL INDIVIDUALS HAVING OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN, KNOWN AS XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES, CASE NO. Z15-004.

OWNER OF RECORD OR AUTHORIZED AGENT

STATE OF _____, S.S.

COUNTY OF _____

THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT WAS ACKNOWLEDGED BEFORE ME THIS DAY OF _____, 20__ BY (Name)

AS (Title) OF _____ AN AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY.

BY _____ WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL

NOTARY PUBLIC

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____

ZIP CODE _____

DESIGN INTENT

THE INTENT OF XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES IS:

- TO CREATE A STABLE, ATTRACTIVE NEIGHBORHOOD THAT WILL OFFER A VARIETY OF HOUSING UNITS ON A SMALL INFILL SITE;
- TO MAXIMIZE THE ADVANTAGE OF THE PROXIMITY TO BUS ROUTES, EMPLOYMENT BASES, RETAILS CENTERS AND LEISURE ACTIVITIES;
- TO BE COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING DEVELOPMENT;
- TO CREATE A THEME FOR THE DEVELOPMENT WHICH WILL ENSURE HIGH QUALITY ELEMENTS AND MATERIALS;
- TO UTILIZE EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE ADJACENT TO THE SITE.

GENERAL DESIGN STANDARDS COMMUNITY DESIGN

THE BASIC DESIGN CONCEPT TYPIFYING XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES IS URBAN IN CHARACTER. KEY DESIGN FEATURES INCLUDE:

- LANDSCAPED STREETSAPES WITH DETACHED WALKS ADJACENT TO THE COLLECTOR STREET;
- COMPATIBILITY BETWEEN BUILDING TYPES THROUGH ARCHITECTURE, BUILDING HEIGHTS AND MATERIALS;
- AN APPROPRIATE TRANSITION FROM ADJACENT USES THROUGH LIMITING BUILDING HEIGHTS, MASS AND SCALE;
- CREATION OF A COMMON THEME THROUGH THE USE OF DECORATIVE LIGHTING, MONUMENTATION AND SIGNAGE, LANDSCAPE FEATURES, MATERIALS COMMON TO THE ENTRY MONUMENTS AND BUILDINGS.

ARCHITECTURE

IT IS THE INTENT OF XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES TO PROVIDE BUILDING TYPES THAT WILL COMPLIMENT ONE ANOTHER THROUGH THE USE OF COMMON DESIGN CRITERIA, THEMES, ARTICULATION AND BUILDING MATERIALS. DESIGN CRITERIA INCLUDE:

- MAJOR BUILDING MATERIALS SHALL BE A COMBINATION OF SIDING AND MASONRY OR SIDING AND STONE;
- FACADE ARTICULATION TO DIFFERENTIATE INDIVIDUAL UNITS;
- PRIVATE OUTDOOR PATIOS OR DECK AREAS FOR EACH UNIT;
- TWO CAR ATTACHED GARAGES FOR EACH UNIT;
- COMPLEX MASSING CONFIGURATIONS WITH A VARIETY OF DIFFERENT WALL PLANES AND ROOF PLANES;
- NO STAIRWAYS OUTSIDE BUILDING ENVELOPES;
- IDENTIFICATION OF ENTRANCES BY AN ARCHITECTURAL TREATMENT SUCH AS A COVERED ENTRY OR A DIFFERENT ROOFLINE TREATMENT;
- MINIMIZATION OF BUILDING MASSING BY LIMITING THE NUMBER OF UNITS IN EACH BUILDING TO FIVE OR LESS;
- DETAILED WINDOW AND DOOR TRIMS;
- INCLUDE PROJECTIONS, RECESSES, SHADOW LINES, WINDOW PATTERNS AND OVERHANGS TO PROVIDE FRONT AND REAR VARIATION IN WALL PLANES;
- PROVIDE FRONT ENTRY DETAIL INCLUDING VERTICAL ELEMENTS TO ENHANCE BUILDING ELEVATIONS;
- PROVIDE WINDOWS ON ALL ELEVATIONS.

SITE DESIGN

THE SITE PLAN EMPHASIZES URBAN. THAT IS ACHIEVED THROUGH BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION, LANDSCAPING AND ARCHITECTURE.

MAINTENANCE EASEMENT

A MAINTENANCE EASEMENT IS REQUIRED FOR DEVELOPMENTS WITH ZERO SIDE SETBACKS IF ONE STRUCTURE IS BUILT ON THE LOT LINE. IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN STRUCTURE WITH THE ZERO SIDE SETBACK, A MAINTENANCE EASEMENT MAY BE REQUIRED ON THE ADJACENT LOT TO ENABLE MAINTENANCE TO BE PERFORMED ON SAID STRUCTURE FROM THE ADJOINING PROPERTY. EACH LOT OWNER AGREES TO ALLOW ADJACENT LOT OWNERS ACCESS ACROSS THEIR LOT, WITHIN FIVE FEET OF THE COMMON LOT LINE, AS MAY BE NEEDED TO MAINTAIN AND REPAIR THE ADJACENT OWNERS PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE. EACH ADJACENT OWNER AGREES TO REPAIR ANY DAMAGE WHICH MAY BE CAUSED TO THE LOT OWNERS PROPERTY FROM THE ADJACENT OWNERS USE OF THIS MAINTENANCE EASEMENT, AND TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY STEPS TO AVOID CAUSING SUCH DAMAGE.

OPEN AREAS AND AMENITIES

IT IS THE INTENT OF XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES TO PROVIDE LANDSCAPING WHICH VISUALLY ENHANCES THE COMMUNITY AND PROVIDES A COMPATIBLE AND AESTHETIC ATMOSPHERE.

- THE SITE WILL PROVIDE:
- OPEN SPACE AREAS BETWEEN BUILDINGS TO CREATE VIEW CORRIDORS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY;
 - DETENTION POND DEVELOPED WITH NATURAL VEGETATION;
 - PEDESTRIAN LINKAGES TO EXTERNAL SIDEWALK SYSTEMS;
 - COMPLIANCE WITH THE LANDSCAPE DESIGN STANDARDS, ARAPAHOE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE;

SHEET INDEX

SHEET NO. SHEET TITLE

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1 | COVER SHEET |
| 2 | SITE PLAN |

SIGNAGE AND ENTRYWAY DESIGN

IT IS THE INTENT OF XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES TO PROVIDE MONUMENTATION AND SIGNAGE THAT WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH OR COMPLIMENTARY TO THE ARCHITECTURAL THEME AND PROVIDE A NEIGHBORHOOD IDENTITY FOR THE COMMUNITY. THE PRIMARY ENTRYWAY DESIGN WILL BE LOCATED AT E. MISSISSIPPI AND XENIA ST. (SIGNAGE SHALL NOT BE INSTALLED WITHIN THE COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY. SIGNAGE SHALL CONFORM TO ARAPAHOE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE STANDARDS.)

LIGHTING

IT IS THE INTENT OF XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES TO PROVIDE SOFT OUTDOOR LIGHTING AT A HUMAN SCALE WHICH WILL ENHANCE THE COMMUNITY WHILE ALLOWING EASY IDENTIFICATION OF ADDRESSES, DRIVES AND COMMON ELEMENTS SUCH AS AMENITY AREAS. ALL LIGHTING MOUNTED ON BUILDINGS AND POLES.

ALL LIGHTING SHALL, AT A MINIMUM, CONFORM TO THE LIGHTING STANDARDS IN THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.

LANDSCAPING:

- ORIENT UNITS ON THE PERIMETER OF THE SITE WITH THE REAR ELEVATION TO THE INTERIOR PRIVATE DRIVEWAYS. MAXIMIZE OPEN SPACE VIEW CORRIDORS WITH PEDESTRIAN LINKAGES.
- PROVIDE STREETScape LANDSCAPING BETWEEN FRONT OF UNITS.

CIRCULATION AND PARKING

IT IS THE INTENT OF XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES TO PROVIDE A CONVENIENT, CLEAR, SAFE AND EFFICIENT CIRCULATION SYSTEM FOR BOTH PEDESTRIAN AND AUTOMOBILE TRAFFIC.

PEDESTRIAN:

- PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS;
- INCORPORATION OF THEMATIC MATERIALS, COLORS, AND DESIGN INTO THE PEDESTRIAN ELEMENT;
- SITE AMENITIES TO BE LOCATED FOR PEDESTRIAN CONVENIENCE AND SHOULD MATCH THE ARCHITECTURAL THEME OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION:

- ORIENT UNITS ON THE SITE WITH THE GARAGE FACING THE INTERIOR PRIVATE ALLEYS. PROVIDE A MINIMUM 10' FOOT LANDSCAPED AREA WITH PEDESTRIAN WALKS BETWEEN BUILDINGS AND FROM THE FACADES TO ADJACENT RIGHTS OF WAY.

VEHICULAR

- ATTACHED GARAGES WITH INTERNALIZED SURFACE PARKING.

Drawing name: S:\Entitlement Engineering\14109 - Mississippi & Xenia CAD\Sheets\DDP\Preliminary Development\Plan.dwg COVER SHEET Dec 30, 2015 2:53pm by: PFeero

STANDARD NOTES
THE OWNER(S), DEVELOPER(S) AND/OR SUBDIVIDERS(S) OF THE PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN KNOWN AS XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES, THEIR RESPECTIVE SUCCESSORS, HEIRS AND/OR ASSIGNS AGREE TO THE FOLLOWING NOTES:

STREET MAINTENANCE
IT IS MUTUALLY UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED THAT THE DEDICATED ROADWAYS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT/PLAN WILL NOT BE MAINTAINED BY THE COUNTY UNTIL AND UNLESS THE STREETS ARE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS IN EFFECT AT THE DATE CONSTRUCTION PLANS ARE APPROVED, AND PROVIDED CONSTRUCTION OF SAID ROADWAYS IS STARTED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THE CONSTRUCTION PLAN APPROVAL. THE OWNERS, DEVELOPERS AND/OR SUBDIVIDERS, THEIR SUCCESSORS AND/OR ASSIGNS IN INTEREST, SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR STREET MAINTENANCE UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE COUNTY ACCEPTS THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAINTENANCE AS STATED ABOVE.

DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE
THE PROPERTY OWNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTENANCE OF ALL DRAINAGE FACILITIES INSTALLED PURSUANT TO THE SUBDIVISION AGREEMENT. REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO MAINTAINING THE SPECIFIED STORM WATER DETENTION/RETENTION VOLUMES, MAINTAINING OUTLET STRUCTURES, FLOW RESTRICTION DEVICES AND FACILITIES NEEDED TO CONVEY FLOW TO SAID BASINS. ARAPAHOE COUNTY SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO ENTER PROPERTIES TO INSPECT SAID FACILITIES AT ANY TIME. IF THESE FACILITIES ARE NOT PROPERLY MAINTAINED, THE COUNTY MAY PROVIDE NECESSARY MAINTENANCE AND ASSESS THE MAINTENANCE COST TO THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY.

EMERGENCY ACCESS NOTE
EMERGENCY ACCESS IS GRANTED HEREWITH OVER AND ACROSS ALL PAVED AREAS FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY VEHICLES.

LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE
THE OWNERS OF THIS PLAN OR PLAT, THEIR SUCCESSORS AND/OR ASSIGNS IN INTEREST, THE ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER(S), HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION OR OTHER ENTITY OTHER THAN ARAPAHOE COUNTY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTENANCE AND UPKEEP OF PERIMETER FENCING, LANDSCAPED AREAS AND SIDEWALKS BETWEEN THE FENCE LINE/PROPERTY LINE AND ANY PAVED ROADWAYS. THE OWNERS OF THIS SUBDIVISION, THEIR SUCCESSORS AND/OR ASSIGNS IN INTEREST, OR SOME OTHER ENTITY OTHER THAN ARAPAHOE COUNTY, AGREE TO THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MAINTAINING ALL OTHER OPEN SPACE AREAS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT.

SIGHT TRIANGLE MAINTENANCE
THE OWNERS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY CONTAINING A TRAFFIC SIGHT TRIANGLE ARE PROHIBITED FROM ERECTING OR GROWING ANY OBSTRUCTIONS OVER THREE FEET IN HEIGHT ABOVE THE ELEVATION OF THE LOWEST POINT ON THE CROWN OF THE ADJACENT ROADWAY WITHIN SAID TRIANGLE.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

THAT PART OF THE EAST 1/2 NORTHEAST 1/4 NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 4, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT 30 FEET SOUTH AND 20 FEET EAST OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID EAST 1/2 NORTHEAST 1/4 NORTHEAST 1/4

THENCE EAST 104 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 630 FEET;

THENCE WEST 104 FEET;

THENCE NORTH 630 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, EXCEPT ANY PART OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED PROPERTY LYING WITHIN THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 NORTHEAST 1/4 NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SAID SECTION 21, AND FURTHER EXCEPT ANY PORTION THEREOF LYING WITHIN THAT PARCEL CONVEYED TO THE COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE AN DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED MAY 10, 1989 IN BOOK 5693 AT PAGE 654.

CASE # Z15-004

COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO, ALSO KNOWN AS 8850 E. MISSISSIPPI AVE., DENVER, CO 80247, PPI# 1973-21-1-00-047, 1.47 ACRES.

TITLE COMMITMENT NOTES:

THIS LAND SURVEY DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A TITLE SEARCH BY JR ENGINEERING, LLC TO DETERMINE OWNERSHIP OF THIS TRACT, VERIFY THE DESCRIPTION SHOWN, VERIFY THE COMPATIBILITY OF THIS DESCRIPTION WITH THAT OF ADJACENT TRACTS, OR VERIFY EASEMENTS OF RECORD. FOR ALL INFORMATION REGARDING EASEMENTS, RIGHT-OF-WAY OR TITLE OF RECORD, JR ENGINEERING, LLC RELIED UPON TITLE COMMITMENT no. 35500-14-15349 BY NORTH AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE CO. FOR 8850 XENIA LLC., A COLORADO CORPORATION, DATED FEBRUARY 10, 2015 AT 7:00 A.M.

DRAINAGE MASTER PLAN NOTE

THE POLICY OF THE COUNTY REQUIRES THAT ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN THE REQUIRED DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AS SET FORTH BELOW:

1. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT THE LOCAL DRAINAGE SYSTEM AS DEFINED BY THE PHASE III DRAINAGE REPORT AND PLAN.
2. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT THE CONNECTION OF THE SUBDIVISION DRAINAGE SYSTEM TO A DRAINAGE WAY OF ESTABLISHED CONVEYANCE CAPACITY SUCH AS A MASTER PLANNED OUTFALL STORM SEWER OR MASTER PLANNED MAJOR DRAINAGEWAY. THE COUNTY WILL REQUIRE THAT THE CONNECTION OF THE MINOR AND MAJOR SYSTEMS PROVIDE CAPACITY TO CONVEY ONLY THOSE FLOWS (INCLUDING OFFSITE FLOWS) LEAVING THE SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT SITE. TO MINIMIZE OVERALL CAPITAL COSTS, THE COUNTY ENCOURAGES ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS TO JOIN IN DESIGNING AND CONSTRUCTING CONNECTION SYSTEMS. ALSO, THE COUNTY MAY CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE WITH A DEVELOPER IN THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE CONNECTION SYSTEM.
3. EQUITABLE PARTICIPATION IN THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE MAJOR DRAINAGEWAY SYSTEM THAT SERVES THE DEVELOPMENT AS DEFINED BY ADOPTED MASTER DRAINAGEWAY PLANS (SECTION 3.4 OF THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT MANUAL) OR AS REQUIRED BY THE COUNTY AND DESIGNATED IN THE PHASE III DRAINAGE REPORT

FOUR SQUARE MILE AREA NOTE

- A) TO INCLUDE SAID DEVELOPMENT WITHIN A SPECIAL DISTRICT FOR THE PURPOSE OF PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF NECESSARY OFFSITE IMPROVEMENTS AT THE TIME OF APPROVAL OF FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS.
- B) TO COOPERATE WITH OTHER OWNERS OF OTHER PARCELS AND/OR SPECIAL DISTRICTS IN OFF-SITE ROADWAY AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS AS NECESSITATED BY DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS AS MAYBE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.
- C) TO INCLUDE SAID DEVELOPMENT IN A MASTER DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT IF SUCH A DISTRICT IS FORMED.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS APPROVAL

APPROVED BY THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
THIS _____ DAY OF _____ A.D., 20__ CHAIR: _____

ATTEST: _____

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

NOT RECOMMENDED/RECOMMENDED BY THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION,
THIS _____ DAY OF _____ A.D., 20__

CHAIR: _____



7200 E. HAMPDEN AVE. SUITE 300 DENVER, CO 80224 303-298-1644

XENIA STREET TOWNHOMES

ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO

SUBMITTAL DATE: AUGUST 3, 2015

PROJECT # 14109

REVISIONS:

PHASE II SUBMITTAL 10/07/2015

MYLAR - CHECK PRINT 12/30/2015

SHEET
1 OF 2

XENIA ST. TOWNHOMES

PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

LOCATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRICIPAL MERIDIAN

LEGEND


- EXISTING ROW
- SECTION LINE
- ROW DEDICATION
- PU AND SIGNAGE ESMT.
- LANE STRIP
- SUBJECT PROPERTY LINE
- EX. PROPERTY LINE
- EX. EOA
- EX. FL
- EX. TBC
- EX. SIDEWALK
- EX. STORM PIPE
- EX. INLET
- EX. MANHOLE

SITE DATA

GROSS AREA	64,291 sf	1.48 ac
E. MISSISSIPPI R.O.W. DEDICATION	1,894 sf	0.05 ac
NET AREA	62,397 sf	1.43 ac
PROPOSED DENSITY	32 UNITS	21.6 DU/AC GROSS 22.4 DU/AC NET
ZONING	EXISTING R-A	PROPOSED R-PH


DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA:

PROPERTY SETBACKS: FROM R.O.W./ PROPERTY BOUNDARY		
EAST PROP. BOUNDARY (ADJ. PRIV. PROP.):	10'-0" MIN TO SIDE OF BUILDING	
NORTH PROP. BOUNDARY (E. MISS. AVE.):	54'-0" MIN TO FRONT OF BUILDING	
SOUTH PROP. BOUNDARY (ADJ. PRIV. PROP.):	10'-0" MIN TO FRONT OF BUILDING	
WEST PROP. BOUNDARY (S. XENIA ST.):	15'-0" MIN TO SIDE OF BUILDING	
BUILDING SETBACKS: BUILDING-BUILDING		
GARAGE-GARAGE	30'-0" MIN.	
FRONT-FRONT	40'-0" MIN.	
BUILDINGS		
HEIGHT:	PER COUNTY CODE R-PH	PROPOSED
# OF STORIES:	N/A	38'-0" MAX 3 STORIES
OPEN SPACE: (COVERAGE)		
	35%	35% MINIMUM
PARKING: (MINIMUM)		
STANDARD SPACES:	2.0 SPACES PER UNIT	2.0 SPACES PER UNIT
GUEST SPACES:	0.25 SPACES PER UNIT	0.25 SPACES PER UNIT
ACCESSIBLE PARKING:	2 TOTAL SPACES MIN.	



1. LANDSCAPING AND BUFFERING WILL BE SHOWN ON THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
2. EXTERIOR LIGHTING WILL BE SHOWN ON THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
3. SIGNAGE WILL INCLUDE ONE PROJECT IDENTIFICATION SIGN. SIGN DETAILS WILL BE SHOWN ON THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND WILL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARAPAHOE COUNTY CODE.
4. PARKING REQUIREMENTS:
2 BEDROOM UNITS (2 STALLS)
3 BEDROOM UNITS (2 STALLS)
PLUS GUESTS (0.25 STALLS/UNIT - BOTH 2 AND 3 BEDROOM UNITS)
5. FENCING AND WALL LOCATIONS AND MATERIALS TO BE DETERMINED IN FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
6. PERIMETER FENCE/WALL SHALL BE NO MORE THAN 8' IN HEIGHT.
7. MINIMUM UNOBSTRUCTED OPEN SPACE DOES NOT INCLUDE RIGHT OF WAY. IT DOES INCLUDE PUBLIC SIDEWALKS AND LANDSCAPE IN THE PUBLIC USE EASEMENT.
8. MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE SHALL NOT EXCEED 35%.

CURVE TABLE				
CURVE #	ARC LENGTH	RADIUS	DELTA ANGLE	CHORD BEARING
C1	31.42	20.00	90°00'00"	N44°50'46"E
				28.28



NOTES:

1. IMPROVEMENTS IN S. XENIA ST. SHALL BE PER ARAPAHOE COUNTY STREET CRITERIA.
2. PER ARAPAHOE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, STRUCTURES, SITE AMENITIES OR PLANT MATERIAL GREATER THAN 30' IN HEIGHT ARE NOT PERMITTED WITHIN THE SITE TRIANGLES.
3. STORM SEWER SYSTEM WILL BE DESIGNED WITH THE PHASE III DRAINAGE REPORT. CONVEYANCE OF RUNOFF WILL BE THROUGH SWALES, ROADWAY AND UNDERGROUND STORM SYSTEM.
4. THE DETENTION FACILITY WILL BE PLACED IN AN EASEMENT AT THE TIME OF THE FINAL PLAT.

ph 303.450.4437
 fx 303.477.8880
 www.goddensudik.com
 Plaza Quebec
 8025 S. Quebec St.
 Suite 375
 Centennial, Colorado 80111

7200 E. HAMPDEN AVE. SUITE 300 DENVER, CO 80224 303-298-1644

XENIA STREET TOWNHOMES

ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO	
SUBMITTAL DATE:	AUGUST 3, 2015
PROJECT #	14109
REVISIONS:	
PHASE II SUBMITTAL	10/07/2015
MYLAR - CHECK PRINT	12/30/2015

SHEET
2 OF 2